NOTE

This Microfiche meets the quality requirements of the American National Standard for Microfiche of Documents (ANSI PH5.9-1975). However, because of imperfections in the document from which it was made, it contains images that are illegible or difficult to read. The source document for this microfiche is the best copy that could be obtained prior to filming.

CIS Congressional Information Service, Inc
Washington, D.C.

Calendar No. 912

99TH CONGRESS
2d Session
SENATE
REPORT
99-441

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1987

SEPTEMBER 15, 1986.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. HATFIELD, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 5162]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 5162) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with various amendments and presents herewith information relative to the changes recommended:

AMOUNT IN NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY, FISCAL YEAR 1987

Amount of bill as passed by the House	$15,548,000,000
Budget estimates considered by House	15,867,643,000
Budget estimates considered by Senate	15,870,143,000
Section 302(b) budget resolution allocation	14,531,000,000
Amount of bill as reported to the Senate	14,529,255,000
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Under the budget estimate, 1987	−1,340,888,000
Under the House-passed bill	−1,018,745,000
Under 302(b) allocation	−1,745,000

S183-11

CONTENTS

TITLE I

Page

Department of Defense—Civil: Department of the Army:
- Corps of Engineers—Civil:
  - Construction, general ... 23
  - Flood control and coastal emergencies ... 41
  - Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries ... 42
  - General expenses ... 70
  - General investigations ... 6
  - Operation and maintenance, general ... 49
  - Revolving fund ... 70

TITLE II

Department of the Interior:
- Bureau of Reclamation:
  - Construction Program ... 78
  - Emergency fund ... 95
  - General administrative expenses ... 95
  - General investigations ... 71
  - Loan Program ... 91
  - Operation and maintenance ... 91
  - Working Capital Fund ... 96

TITLE III

Department of Energy:
- Atomic energy defense activities ... 158
- Departmental administration ... 193
- Energy supply, research and development activities ... 97
- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ... 207
- General science and research activities ... 149
- Geothermal Resources Development Fund ... 208
- Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund ... 157
- Power marketing administrations:
  - Alaska Power Administration ... 203
  - Bonneville Power Administration ... 203
  - Southeastern Power Administration ... 205
  - Southwestern Power Administration ... 205
  - Western Area Power Administration ... 206
- Uranium supply and enrichment activities ... 141

TITLE IV

Independent Agencies:
- Appalachian Regional Commission ... 209
- Delaware River Basin Commission ... 210
- Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin ... 210
- Nuclear Regulatory Commission ... 211
- Susquehanna River Basin Commission ... 212
- Tennessee Valley Authority ... 212

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for the fiscal year 1987 beginning October 1, 1986 and ending September 30, 1987 for energy and water development, and for other related purposes. It supplies funds for water resources development programs and related activities of the Department of the Army, Civil Functions—U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Civil Works Program in title I; for the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation in title II; for the Department of Energy (except for fossil fuel programs, and certain conservation and regulatory programs) in title III; and for related independent agencies and commissions, including the Appalachian Regional Commission and Appalachian Regional Development Programs, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority in title IV.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The fiscal year 1987 budget estimates for this bill totals $15,870,-143,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The recommendation of the Committee totals $14,529,255,000. This is a decrease of $1,340,888,-000 below the budget estimates and $1,018,745,000 below the House bill.

BILL HIGHLIGHTS

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The amount recommended in the bill includes $7,261,600,000 for atomic energy defense activities. Major programs and activities include:

Testing	$623,400,000
Research and development	1,219,400,000
Production and surveillance	2,289,204,000
Nuclear materials production	1,889,146,000
Defense waste management	714,400,000

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

The bill recommended by the Committee provides a total of $1,318,798,000 for energy supply, research, development and demonstration programs including:

Solar energy	$125,792,000
Geothermal energy	20,930,000
Nuclear fission	616,250,000
Magnetic fusion	333,000,000
Environmental	194,065,000
Basic energy sciences	495,470,000

GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation also provides a net appropriation of $677,400,000 for general science and research activities in life sciences, high energy physics and nuclear physics. Major programs are:

High energy physics research	$511,700,000
Nuclear physics	196,200,000

REGULATORY AND OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Also recommended in the bill is $599,383,000 for various regulatory and independent agencies of the Federal Government. Major programs and activities include:

Appalachian regional development programs	$105,000,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	99,079,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	391,000,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	100,000,000

Water Resources Development

The Committee has also recommended appropriations totaling approximately $3,895,655,000 for Federal water resource development programs. This includes projects and related activities of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Federal water resource development program provides lasting benefits to the Nation in the areas of flood control, municipal and industrial water supply, irrigation of agricultural lands, water conservation, commercial navigation, hydroelectric power, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement.

Water is our Nation's most precious and valuable resource. It is evident that water supply in the near future will be as important, if not more so, than energy supply. There is only so much water available. Water cannot be manufactured. Our Nation cannot survive without water, and economic prosperity cannot occur without a plentiful supply.

While many areas of the country suffer from severe shortages of water, others suffer from the other extreme—an excess of water which threatens both rural and urban areas with floods. Because water is a national asset, and because the availability or control of water affects and benefits all States and jurisdictions, the Federal Government has historically assumed much of the responsibility for financing of water resources development.

The existing national water resource infrastructure in America is an impressive system of dams, locks, harbors, canals, irrigation systems, reservoirs, and recreation sites with one central purpose—to serve the public's needs.

Our waterways and harbors are an essential part of our national transportation system—providing clean, efficient, and economical transportation of fuels for energy generation and agricultural production, and for making possible residential and industrial development to provide homes and jobs for the American people.

Reservoir projects provide for hydroelectric power generation and downstream flood protection, make available recreational opportunities for millions of urban and rural residents, enhance fish and wildlife habitat, and provide our communities and industries with abundant and clean water supplies which are essential not only to life itself, but also to help maintain a high standard of living for the American people.

When projects are completed, they make enormous contributions to America. The benefits derived from completed projects, in many instances, vastly exceed those contemplated during project development.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations held 15 sessions of hearings in connection with the fiscal year 1987 appropriation bill. The Committee has received testimony from the executive branch, numerous Members of the House and Senate, several Governors, other State and local elected officials, and private citizens. The recommendations for 1987 have, therefore, been developed after careful consideration of available data.

VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE

The subcommittee, by unanimous vote of a quorum present, on August 7, 1986, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported to the full Committee on Appropriations.

The Committee, by unanimous vote of a quorum present on August 12, 1986, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1986	$123,478,000
Budget estimate, 1987	127,000,000
House allowance	149,411,000
Committee recommendation	124,240,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−2,760,000
House allowance	−25,171,000

An appropriation of $124,240,000 is recommended by the Committee, which is $25,171,000 below the House allowance and $2,760,000 below the budget request.

The recommended amounts provided under this heading for surveys and planning activities are shown in the following table, with Committee comments following immediately after the tabulation.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	ALABAMA								
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE	269,000	205,000	60,000	---	60,000	---	60,000	---
(FC)	FT. TOULOUSE	1,400,000	---	---	---	---	750,000	---	---
(FC)	MOUNDVILLE	510,000	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	---
(FDP)	VALLEY CREEK, WARRIOR RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	598,000	250,000	148,000	---	148,000	---	148,000	---
	ALASKA								
(FDP)	HOMER SPIT EROSION	802,000	365,000	297,000	---	297,000	---	297,000	---
(FDP)	RIVERS AND HARBORS	9,620,000	3,907,000	946,000	---	946,000	---	946,000	---
(N)	SOUTHCENTRAL DEEP-DRAFT NAVIGATION	2,015,000	1,648,000	163,000	---	163,000	---	163,000	---
(N)	ST PAUL HARBOR (CP&E)	550,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
	ARIZONA								
(FDP)	GILA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, AZ & NM	5,190,000	4,453,000	276,000	---	506,000	---	276,000	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NOGALES WASH	735,000	580,000	85,000	---	85,000	---	85,000	---
(FC)	GILA RIVER AND TRIBS, RILLITO INTERIM (CP&E)	800,000	---	---	---	150,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	NAVAJO INDIAN RESERVATION, AZ, NM, & UTAH	470,000	---	---	---	470,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	NAVAJO INDIAN RESERVATION, GANADO DAM	300,000	---	---	---	---	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	PHOENIX METRO AREA (OLD CROSS CUT CANAL)	3,808,000	3,702,000	38,000	---	38,000	---	38,000	---
	ARKANSAS								
(FDP)	ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN, AR & AK	1,360,000	310,000	550,000	---	550,000	---	550,000	---
(FDP)	CLARKSVILLE	900,000	644,000	175,000	---	175,000	---	175,000	---
(FC)	NORTH LITTLE ROCK (DARK HOLLOW) (CP&E)	540,000	165,000	75,000	---	75,000	---	75,000	---
(FDP)	OUACHITA RIVER BASIN, AR & LA	8,390,000	7,736,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(COMP)	WHITE RIVER BASIN AUTHORIZATION REPORT, AR & MO	1,155,000	460,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	CALIFORNIA								
(N)	BOLSA CHICA/SUNSET HARBOR STUDY	1,830,000	---	---	---	250,000	---	---	---
(FC)	CACHE CREEK BASIN (CP&E)	2,300,000	1,444,000	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(SPEC)	COAST OF CALIFORNIA, STORM AND TIDAL WAVES	7,740,000	4,197,000	1,000,000	---	1,500,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	GUADALUPE RIVER (CP&E)	1,500,000	265,000	750,000	---	750,000	---	750,000	---
(FDP)	IMPERIAL VAL & SAN DIEGO CO. STREAMS	2,011,000	11,000	---	---	400,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA REVIEW	5,500,000	3,898,000	1,150,000	---	1,150,000	---	1,150,000	---
(FDP)	MARIN COUNTY SHORELINE, SAN RAFAEL CANAL	260,000	---	260,000	---	260,000	---	260,000	---
(N)	MORRO BAY HARBOR	1,100,000	154,000	---	---	280,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, DRY CREEK	750,000	444,000	100,000	---	150,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, BLUE RIDGE	200,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED	500,000	---	---	---	500,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	OAKLAND INNER HARBOR (CP&E)	820,000	389,000	415,000	---	415,000	---	415,000	---
(N)	OCEANSIDE HARBOR	790,000	680,000	---	---	110,000	---	110,000	---
(N)	POINT MUGU TO SAN PEDRO BREAKWATER	874,000	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
(N)	REDONDO BEACH (KING HARBOR)	730,000	344,000	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
(NO	RICHMOND HARBOR (CP&E)	500,000	---	---	---	---	---	---	500,000
(FDP)	SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA	2,900,000	2,168,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CALIENTE CREEK STREAM GROUP	1,778,000	647,000	120,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, KAWEAH RIVER INTERIM	715,000	273,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY SHORELINE	4,280,000	2,623,000	840,000	---	840,000	---	840,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TULE RIVER INTERIM	650,000	239,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN & ORANGE COUNTY	9,500,000	7,749,000	600,000	---	600,000	---	700,000	---
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER (PHASE 1) (CP&E)	17,300,000	14,958,000	3,500,000	---	6,000,000	---	3,500,000	---
(SP)	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY (BEACH EROSION)	410,000	168,000	---	---	149,000	---	---	---
(RDP)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR	220,000	---	---	---	220,000	---	---	---
(N)	VENTURA MARINA (REVIEW)	635,000	250,000	175,000	---	175,000	---	175,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	COLORADO								
(FDP)	ARKANSAS RIVER & TRIBS ABOVE JOHN MARTIN DAM (PHASE I)	5,315,000	3,411,000	735,000	---	735,000	---	735,000	---
(FDP)	FOUNTAIN CREEK AND TRIBS - NORTH OF PUEBLO	680,000	295,000	210,000	---	210,000	---	210,000	---
(FC)	WESTERLY CREEK (CP&E)	490,000	239,000	240,000	---	240,000	---	240,000	---
	COMM N. MARIANAS								
(N)	NORTHERN MARIANAS ISLANDS (COMPREHENSIVE)	510,000	360,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
	CONNECTICUT								
(COMP)	CONN RVR BSN, AUTH REPORTS, CT, MA, NH, VT	4,545,000	2,722,000	190,000	---	190,000	---	190,000	---
(COMP)	LONG ISLAND SOUND-AUTHORIZATION REPORTS, CT & RI	460,000	404,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(N)	NEW HAVEN HARBOR (CP&E)	550,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---
(COMP)	WEST CENTRAL CONNECTICUT COASTAL FLOODING	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
	DIST OF COLUMBIA								
(FC)	WASHINGTON, DC & VICINITY (1946 MOD)	2,000,000	172,000	---	485,000	---	485,000	---	485,000
	FLORIDA								
SPEC	BANANA LAKE RESTORATION	---	---	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(N)	BISCAYNE BAY	1,660,000	255,000	---	---	350,000	---	100,000	---
(SP)	BREVARD COUNTY	264,000	110,000	---	---	75,000	---	---	---
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR	50,000	---	---	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(N)	CLEARWATER SPOIL DISPOSAL	237,000	60,000	---	---	77,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	COAST OF FLORIDA EROSION AND STORM EFFECTS STUDY	5,520,000	220,000	750,000	---	750,000	---	750,000	---
(SP)	FLAGLER COUNTY (CP&E)	200,000	---	---	---	115,000	---	---	---
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR (CP&E)	200,000	106,000	90,000	---	90,000	---	90,000	---
(RDP)	HUDSON RIVER	100,000	48,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, ST JOHN'S RIVER & INW	490,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
(N)	JUPITER INLET	184,000	50,000	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(N)	MEXICO BEACH INLET (CP&E)	100,000	---	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL (CP&E)	740,000	---	---	---	250,000	---	100,000	---
(BE)	MONROE COUNTY (CP&E)	218,000	125,000	---	---	93,000	---	93,000	---
SPEC	NORTHWEST FL WATER SUPPLY STUDY	350,000	---	---	---	350,000	---	---	---
(N)	PORT EVERGLADES	140,000	43,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(BE)	SARASOTA COUNTRY (CP&E)	467,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
(BE)	ST. JOHNS COUNTY (CP&E)	900,000	---	---	---	180,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	ST. JOHNS RIVER	1,310,000	100,000	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	ST. MARYS RIVER BASIN, FL & GA	1,075,000	696,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(RDP)	ST. PETERSBURG (ECONOMIC RESTUDY)	125,000	25,000	---	---	75,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	SUWANNEE RIVER	1,648,000	880,000	---	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	TAMPA BAY, HURRICANE EVACUATION	300,000	75,000	---	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
SPEC	WITHLACOOCHEE RIVER	200,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
	GEORGIA								
(N)	APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE, FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL & FL	2,268,000	708,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR	1,370,000	550,000	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	NORTHEAST GEORGIA REGION	1,541,000	1,271,000	259,000	---	259,000	---	259,000	---
(FDP)	SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA, SC & NC	950,000	1,234,000	210,000	---	210,000	---	210,000	---
(FDP)	TURKEY CREEK	334,000	144,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	SOUTH METROPOLITAN ATLANTA REGION	1,100,000	300,000	---	---	---	---	300,000	---
	GUAM								
(N)	HARBORS & RIVERS IN TERRITORY OF GUAM	3,538,000	3,260,000	270,000	---	270,000	---	270,000	---
	HAWAII								
(FDP)	HARBORS & RIVERS IN HAWAII	3,429,000	3,305,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	HARBORS & RIVERS IN HAWAII - SO. KOHALA WATER SUPPLY	350,000	160,000	117,000	---	117,000	---	117,000	---
(FDP)	HARBORS & RIVERS IN HAWAII, KEOPU-HIEWALOLI STREAM	300,000	---	130,000	---	130,000	---	130,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	IDAHO								
(FDP)	COLUMBIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ID, MT, OR, & WA.....	22,122,000	17,204,000	1,809,000	---	1,809,000	---	1,809,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER SNAKE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ID & WY.....	8,283,000	5,527,000	836,000	---	836,000	---	836,000	---
	ILLINOIS								
(FDP)	ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES.....	1,300,000	263,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	CHICAGO - SOUTH END OF LAKE MICHIGAN, IL & IN.....	4,901,000	3,780,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	CHICAGOLAND UNDERFLOW PLAN, PHASE 1 GDM.....	9,636,000	9,660,000	---	---	400,000	---	---	---
(SPEC)	DIVERSION OF LAKE MICHIGAN WATER AT CHICAGO.....	1,981,000	1,731,000	230,000	---	230,000	---	230,000	---
(FDP)	ILLINOIS RIVER BETWEEN HENRY AND MAPLES.....	1,630,000	767,000	330,000	---	330,000	---	330,000	---
(SP)	ILLINOIS SHORELINE EROSION.....	1,608,000	640,000	415,000	---	415,000	---	415,000	---
(N)	LOCKS AND DAMS 52 & 53, IL & KY.....	7,500,000	239,000	1,500,000	---	2,500,000	---	2,000,000	---
(FC)	LOVES PARK (CP&E).....	1,505,000	511,000	490,000	---	490,000	---	490,000	---
(FC)	NORTH BRANCH CHICAGO RIVER, PHASE I (CP&E).....	820,000	1,029,000	---	---	230,000	---	---	---
	INDIANA								
(FDP)	FORT WAYNE METROPOLIAN AREA.....	936,000	811,000	121,000	---	121,000	---	121,000	---
(BE)	INDIANA SHORELINE EROSION (CP&E).....	215,000	107,000	---	---	108,000	---	---	---
	LAKE GEORGE IN HOBART.....	---	---	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, PHASE I (CP&E).....	1,400,000	3,709,000	273,000	---	273,000	---	273,000	---
(COMP)	WABASH RIVER COMP STY, IN & IL - WABASH RIVER NAVIGABILITY.....	2,900,000	600,000	200,000	---	350,000	---	---	---
	IOWA								
(FC)	MUSCATINE ISLAND LEVEE AND DRAINAGE DISTRICT (CP&E)...	4,515,000	---	---	---	150,000	---	---	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	KANSAS								
(FDP)	ARK R & TRIBS, GREAT BEND, KS TO TULSA, OK (REMAINING)	7,290,000	5,295,000	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---
(FDP)	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KS AND MO	585,000	239,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	DOUGLASS LAKE	3,000,000	404,000	---	265,000	---	265,000	---	265,000
(FDP)	GRAND NEOSHO RIVER, KS AND OK	3,660,000	838,000	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---
(FDP)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	670,000	---	310,000	---	310,000	---	310,000	---
(RDP)	WINFIELD	570,000	511,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
	KENTUCKY								
(N)	BIG SANDY RIVER, KY, WV & VA	3,912,000	3,218,000	165,000	---	165,000	---	165,000	---
(N)	CUMBERLAND-TENNESSEE RIVERS, KY,GA,AL,MS,NC,TN & VA	7,222,000	3,291,000	1,450,000	---	1,450,000	---	1,450,000	---
(FDP)	KENTUCKY RIVER & TRIBS, STATION CAMP CREEK	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	KENTUCKY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	2,917,000	2,474,000	430,000	---	430,000	---	430,000	---
(FDP)	OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV	14,970,000	9,458,000	2,560,000	---	2,560,000	---	2,560,000	---
(FDP)	TRADEWATER RIVER BASIN	850,000	285,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	LOUISIANA								
(FDP)	AHITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	2,145,000	1,037,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(N)	BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE - JUMP WATERWAY	180,000	77,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA & TX SECTION	4,270,000	2,874,000	625,000	---	625,000	---	625,000	---
(FDP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA - LAND LOSS AND MARSH CREATION	1,515,000	683,000	220,000	---	220,000	---	220,000	---
SPEC	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA - WATER SUPPLY	2,233,000	812,000	430,000	---	430,000	---	430,000	---
(FDP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA - HURRICANE PROTECTION	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(SP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA - SHORE & BARRIER ISLAND EROSION	1,670,000	656,000	240,000	---	240,000	---	240,000	---
(FDP)	MERMENTAU, VERMILION & CALCASIEU RIVERS & BAYOU TECHE	4,950,000	2,375,000	460,000	---	460,000	---	460,000	---
	MISS RV GULF OUTLET BANK EROSION (ST. BERNARD)	160,000	---	---	---	160,000	---	---	---
(FC)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, SHREVEPORT,LA TO VICINITY INDEX,AR	1,700,000	858,000	---	---	---	520,000	---	300,000
(FDP)	UPPER BAYOU TECHE	385,000	---	140,000	---	220,000	---	140,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	MAINE								
(FDP)	SAINT JOHN RIVER	3,000,000	1,936,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
	MARYLAND								
(BE)	ATLANTIC COAST OF MD (CP&E)	1,800,000	239,000	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(SP)	CHESAPEAKE BAY (SHORELINE EROSION), MD & VA	2,000,000	500,000	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---
(FDP)	MONONGAHELA-YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER BASIN, MD, PA & WV	8,733,000	6,161,000	700,000	---	700,000	---	700,000	---
	MASSACHUSETTS								
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR	735,000	649,000	80,000	---	80,000	---	80,000	---
(FC)	MASSACHUSETTS COASTAL, ROUGHANS POINT, REVERE (CP&E)	905,000	588,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(COMP)	SOUTHEASTERN NEW ENG AUTH, REPORTS, MA, RI & CT	2,550,000	2,242,000	223,000	---	223,000	---	223,000	---
	MICHIGAN								
(FDP)	GREAT LAKES PARTICULARLY LAKE ONTARIO & LAKE ERIE - OVERALL	9,865,000	9,414,000	130,000	---	130,000	---	130,000	---
(FDP)	SAGINAW RIVER	3,800,000	1,131,000	900,000	---	900,000	---	900,000	---
	MINNESOTA								
(N)	DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI (CP&E)	575,000	---	180,000	---	180,000	---	180,000	---
(FC)	EAST GRAND FORKS	2,000,000	1,418,000	---	512,000	---	512,000	---	512,000
(FDP)	MINNESOTA RIVER VALLEY	6,750,000	4,959,000	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FDP)	RED RIVER OF THE NORTH, MN AND ND	8,790,000	8,297,000	470,000	---	870,000	---	470,000	---
(FC)	ROOT RIVER AT HOUSTON (CP&E)	755,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	TWIN VALLEY LAKE, WILD RICE RIVER	2,200,000	2,058,000	---	138,000	---	138,000	---	138,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	MISSISSIPPI								
(N)	GULFPORT HARBOR	2,500,000	15,000	---	---	---	---	---	800,000
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI GULF COASTAL AREAS	860,000	329,000	215,000	---	215,000	---	215,000	---
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR (CP&E)	1,900,000	---	---	---	900,000	---	900,000	---
(FDP)	PEARL RIVER BASIN, MS & LA	8,600,000	4,647,000	590,000	---	590,000	---	590,000	---
(FC)	PEARL RIVER, SHOCCOE DAM (CP&E)	2,800,000	718,000	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FDP)	TOMBIGBEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MS & AL	3,440,000	191,000	990,000	---	990,000	---	990,000	---
	MISSOURI								
(FC)	BRUSH CREEK, KANSAS CITY (CP&E)	775,000	335,000	425,000	---	425,000	---	425,000	---
(FC)	CAPE GIRARDEAU - JACKSON METRO AREA (CP&E)	1,600,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	CREVE COEUR CREEK	1,100,000	478,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FC)	HANNIBAL	775,000	534,000	---	124,000	---	124,000	---	124,000
(FC)	MALINE CREEK (CP&E)	2,500,000	561,000	465,000	---	465,000	---	465,000	---
(SPEC)	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN	700,000	216,000	480,000	---	480,000	---	480,000	---
(FDP)	OSAGE RIVER BASIN, MO, ABOVE HARRY S. TRUMAN DAM	1,370,000	881,000	275,000	---	275,000	---	275,000	---
(FDP)	ST. JOSEPH, MO AND VICINITY	510,000	---	210,000	---	210,000	---	210,000	---
(N)	ST. LOUIS HARBOR, MO & IL (CP&E)	1,700,000	1,007,000	---	---	500,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	ST. LOUIS METROPOLITAN AREA, MO & IL	11,860,000	10,050,000	1,054,000	---	1,054,000	---	1,054,000	---
	NEBRASKA								
(FDP)	PLATTE RIVER BASIN, NE, WY AND CO	559,000	191,000	140,000	---	140,000	---	140,000	---
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK & TRIBS LAKES (CP&E)	300,000	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	REPUBLICAN RIVER, HARLAN COUNTY DAM TO MILFORD LAKE, NE & KS	540,000	330,000	135,000	---	135,000	---	135,000	---
(RCP)	SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES	410,000	265,000	145,000	---	145,000	---	145,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	NEVADA								
(FDP)	LAS VEGAS WASH & TRIBUTARIES	1,652,000	859,000	320,000	---	320,000	---	320,000	---
	NEW JERSEY								
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER COMPREHENSIVE NAVIGATION STUDY, NJ, PA & DE	6,334,000	2,592,000	850,000	---	850,000	---	850,000	---
(FDP)	ELIZABETH RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	195,000	---	195,000	---	195,000	---	195,000	---
(BE)	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET & PECK BEACH, SEC 201, 70	520,000	388,000	---	---	---	132,000	---	---
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY	398,000	---	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(N)	NY HARBOR AND ADJACENT CHANNELS NJ & NY	4,955,000	4,755,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	PASSAIC RIVER BASIN STUDY, NJ & NY (PHASE 1)	21,060,000	16,608,000	2,200,000	---	2,200,000	---	2,200,000	---
(FC)	RAHWAY RIVER BASIN, ROBINSON'S BRANCH, AT RAHWAY (CP&E)	850,000	804,000	35,000	---	35,000	---	35,000	---
(FC)	RAMAPO & MAHWAH RVRS AT MAHWAH, NJ & SUFFERN, NY (PH-1) (CP&E)	470,000	289,000	170,000	---	170,000	---	170,000	---
(FC)	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN (CP&E)	5,000,000	426,000	1,370,000	---	1,370,000	---	1,370,000	---
	NEW MEXICO								
(FC)	ALAMOGORDO	1,270,000	620,000	---	330,000	---	330,000	---	330,000
(RCP)	LAS CRUCES	125,000	50,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FC)	MID RIO GRANDE BERNALILLO TO BELEN (CP&E)	2,460,000	1,252,000	475,000	---	475,000	---	475,000	---
(FDP)	PECOS RIVER AND TRIBS - ROSWELL	825,000	200,000	95,000	---	95,000	---	75,000	---
(FDP)	PECOS RIVER AND TRIBS - CARLSBAD	720,000	200,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM & CO	7,070,000	5,749,000	500,000	---	550,000	---	500,000	---
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY - TRUTH OR CONSEQUENCES UNIT	1,330,000	1,114,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY,SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE	1,230,000	---	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000

Santa Ana River, CA.—The Committee has provided $700,000 for the Santa Ana and Orange County, CA, study. The amount provided is the Corps' full capability and will allow the Corps to complete the final study in 1988, 1 year ahead of the present schedule.

The Committee reiterates its desire that planning and engineering of all elements of the project proceed concurrently. The Committee notes that the Board of Engineers for River and Harbors has taken favorable action on the report for the Upper Santa Ana Dam and that the Corps has since undertaken continuation of planning and engineering on the dam. The Committee directs that the Corps accelerate the planning and engineering effort on the Upper Santa Ana River Dam so that the phase II design memorandum for the overall project will be completed as a single project document and construction could proceed on elements of the project in both the upstream and downstream areas concurrently.

In addition, the Committee reemphasizes the benefits to be achieved from water conservation activities at Prado Dam and urges the Corps to maximize the level of water conservation consistent with flood control purposes of the dam.

Navajo Indian Reservation, Ganado Dam, AZ.—The Committee has included $200,000 for the Corps to undertake an appraisal level study of the reconstruction of Ganado Dam or the construction of a new Ganado Dam on the Navajo Indian Reservation in Arizona.

Coordination studies with other agencies.—The Committee allowance for coordination studies with other agencies includes $200,000 for section 22 technical assistance for New Jersey; and $200,000 for the Corps to assist the State of North Dakota in developing a technical resource service. Public Law 93–251 limits the amount allocated to any State to no more than $200,000.

Illinois Beach State Park, IL.—The Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to process the Illinois Beach erosion control study through the appropriate review channels. The Committee directs that available funds be used for the purpose of completing this review.

Northern California Streams, American River Watershed, CA.—The bill includes $300,000 for the Corps to engage in a 1-year reconnaissance study of alternate means of flood control in the American River watershed in California predicated on the assumption that an Auburn Dam, as previously authorized, will not be constructed. The Corps is to solicit and evaluate proposals to resolve the flooding problem from the range of interests who have indicated concerns, and to work with the Bureau of Reclamation and State and local interests to take maximum advantage of their expertise and research already performed. The Committee anticipates that focusing on flood control as a primary objective may yield a different and more acceptable approach than the traditional Auburn Dam.

Roanoke River Upper Basin.—The Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers are directed to use the $480,000 provided for continuation of planning and engineering on the Roanoke River Upper Basin

project, including the design of floodproofing for the Roanoke Memorial Hospital and city sewage treatment plant as recommended in the Chief of Engineers report dated August 5, 1985.

Calleguas Creek, CA.—The Committee directs the Corps to use $500,000 of available funds to complete the Calleguas Creek study in California.

Arkansas River Basin, AR and OK.—The Committee does not concur with the House action on the Arkansas River Basin study. The direction included by the House Committee would seriously deter the Corps from implementing modifications to the current Arkansas River system operation plan which are needed to address navigation and flood control needs impacted by high water levels.

Clifton, AZ, Flood Control Project.—The Committee is aware that the Corps of Engineers intends to complete studies related to flood control alternatives for Clifton, AZ, during the current year. Given the need for flood protection in the area, once the decision is made regarding the feasibility of separating the structural and nonstructural elements of the project, and once authorized, the Corps is urged to proceed as expeditiously as possible to budget for funding to accomplish this important work.

North Lake Channel, Hollywood, FL.—The Committee recognizes the importance of this small navigation project to the local economy, and directs the Corps to utilize $25,000 of available funds to complete a feasibility study of the proposed channel improvements.

Las Vegas Wash and Tributaries, NV.—Within the funds provided for the Las Vegas Wash and Tributaries Study, the Secretary of the Army is directed to expedite the ongoing planning of a project for comprehensive flood control on the Las Vegas Wash in the vicinity of Las Vegas, NV. The comprehensive project should include, to the extent feasible, facilities on the following water courses: Duck Creek, Tropicana Wash, Las Vegas Wash, and the Henderson area. The Secretary may include as part of the non-Federal contribution, facilities constructed by non-Federal interests as authorized in omnibus water resources legislation enacted into law. If authorized, costs and benefits resulting from such work, may continue to be included for purposes of determining the economic feasibility of the comprehensive project.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1986	$879,830,000
Budget estimate, 1987	1,072,500,000
House allowance	1,187,734,000
Committee recommendation	1,061,260,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−11,240,000
House allowance	−126,474,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,061,260,000. This is $126,474,000 below the House allowance and $11,240,000 under the budget request for 1987.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	NEW YORK								
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL TO FRESH KILL, NJ-EXTENSION	250,000	---	---	---	250,000	---	---	---
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL-HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL (CP&E)	900,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	BUFFALO METRO AREA (BUFFALO RV & TONAWANDA CREEK)	2,743,000	1,843,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	CATTARAUGUS CREEK	505,000	247,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(BE)	ERIE CO ALONG LAKE ERIE & NIAGARA RIVER	820,000	---	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(COMP)	GENESEE RIVER BASIN AUTH REPORT	855,000	291,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(SP)	LAKE ONTARIO - ST. LAWRENCE RIVER SHORELINE PROTECTION STUDY	4,180,000	15,000	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---
(FDP)	MOOSE & BLACK RIVERS	860,000	---	340,000	---	340,000	---	340,000	---
(FC)	SAW MILL RIVER AT ELMSFORD AND GREENBURGH	950,000	562,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000
(N)	SHINNECOCK INLET	1,000,000	746,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(N)	ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY ADDDITIONAL LOCKS	4,003,000	3,793,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	WESTCHESTER CO. STREAMS - MAMARONECK & SHELDRAKE RIVERS (CP&E)	2,640,000	2,171,000	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---
	NORTH CAROLINA								
(FDP)	EASTERN NORTH CAROLINA ABOVE CAPE LOOKOUT	1,582,000	500,000	460,000	---	710,000	---	460,000	---
(FDP)	LITTLE PEE DEE & PEE DEE RIVERS, NC & SC	1,785,000	1,016,000	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---
(N)	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR	516,000	191,000	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---
(FDP)	NEUSE RIVER	2,963,000	1,020,000	465,000	---	465,000	---	465,000	---
(SP)	WEST ONSLOW BEACH & NEW RIVER INLET	812,000	712,000	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR-NORTHEAST CAPE FEAR RIVER (CP&E)	409,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
	NORTH DAKOTA								
(RDP)	CANNONBALL RIVER AT MOTT	225,000	147,000	145,000	---	145,000	---	145,000	---
(FC)	SHEYENNE RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT	4,200,000	2,649,000	---	695,000	---	695,000	---	695,000
(FDP)	SOURIS RIVER BASIN	1,580,000	440,000	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	OHIO								
(FDP)	CENTRAL OHIO SURVEY	4,035,000	3,469,000	435,000	---	435,000	---	435,000	---
(FDP)	CENTRAL OHIO SURVEY, GRANDVIEW HEIGHTS INTERIM	400,000	191,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	HOLES CREEK AT WEST CARROLLTON AND MORAINE (CP&E)	570,000	144,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	LORAIN HARBOR (CP&E)	317,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(BE)	MAUMEE BAY STATE PARK (CP&E)	900,000	200,000	---	---	250,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	MIAMI RIVER, LITTLE MIAMI R & MILL CR BASINS	4,408,000	4,210,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FDP)	MUSKINGUM RIVER (WOLF CR & TUSCARAWAS RV INTERIM STUDY)	600,000	200,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	NORTH CHILLICOTHE (CP&E)	800,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(SPEC)	OHIO RIVER BETWEEN RIVERMILE 40-491 (WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT)	500,000	---	---	---	500,000	---	---	---
(FC)	OTTAWA	435,000	250,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
(FDP)	SANDUSKY RIVER	965,000	263,000	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---
(FDP)	VERMILION RIVER	470,000	172,000	190,000	---	190,000	---	190,000	---
	OKLAHOMA								
(COMP)	ARK RIV & TRIBS SCISE OF OK (COMP. STUDY)	2,000,000	831,000	600,000	---	750,000	---	600,000	---
(FDP)	CANADIAN RIVER AND TRIBS, OK, TX, AND NM (REMAINING)	2,760,000	2,416,000	155,000	---	155,000	---	155,000	---
(N)	CENTRAL OKLAHOMA PROJECT	2,570,000	1,756,000	150,000	---	---	---	490,000	---
(RCP)	HUGO LAKE (HYDROPOWER STUDY)	740,000	507,000	229,000	---	229,000	---	229,000	---
(SPEC)	LUKFATA LAKE (HYDROPOWER STUDY)	830,000	392,000	---	---	55,000	---	---	---
(FC)	MINGO CREEK (CP&E)	1,860,000	1,398,000	423,000	---	423,000	---	550,000	---
(FC)	PARKER LAKE (CP&E)	2,000,000	1,466,000	---	---	950,000	---	250,000	---
(RCP)	PINE CREEK LAKE (HYDROPOWER STUDY)	690,000	658,000	---	---	30,000	---	---	---
(COMP)	RED RIVER BASIN, OK, AR, LA & TX (COMPREHENSIVE STUDY)	3,100,000	1,190,000	800,000	---	1,150,000	---	800,000	---
	OREGON								
(N)	COOS BAY, OREG	260,000	---	---	---	---	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	UMPQUA RIVER & TRIBS	2,286,000	759,000	565,000	---	565,000	---	565,000	---
(COMP)	WILLAMETTE RIV BASIN	3,725,000	2,049,000	378,000	---	378,000	---	378,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	PENNSYLVANIA								
	CHESAPEAKE BAY - SUSQUEHANNA RIVER DROUGHT MANAGEMENT, PA & MD	900,000	600,000	---	---	---	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	LACKAWANNA RIVER	300,000	---	---	---	300,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	LEHIGH RIVER BASIN	1,985,000	1,826,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FC)	LOCK HAVEN (CP&E)	2,375,000	1,794,000	200,000	---	682,000	---	490,000	---
(FC)	PROMPTON LAKE (MOD)	3,600,000	383,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
(N)	SCHUYLKILL RIVER (MOUTH TO PENROSE AVE.)(CP&E)	250,000	---	---	---	---	---	100,000	---
(FC)	SUSQUEHANNA BASIN AT HARRISBURG (CP&E)	2,900,000	2,144,000	540,000	---	540,000	---	540,000	---
(FC)	WYOMING VALLEY (LEVEE RAISING) (PH-1) (CP&E)	5,700,000	783,000	1,600,000	---	1,600,000	---	1,600,000	---
	PUERTO RICO								
(FDP)	ARECIBO RIVER	370,000	72,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	GUANAJIBO RIVER	884,000	267,000	255,000	---	255,000	---	255,000	---
(FC)	PUERTO NUEVO RIVER (CP&E)	6,000,000	---	---	---	1,500,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	RIO GRANDE DE LOIZA	911,000	443,000	208,000	---	208,000	---	208,000	---
	RHODE ISLAND								
(N)	BRISTOL HARBOR	560,000	500,000	---	40,000	---	40,000	---	40,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA								
(FDP)	GILLS CREEK	1,824,000	1,690,000	116,000	---	116,000	---	116,000	---
(SP)	MYRTLE BEACH	875,000	425,000	---	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	SOUTH DAKOTA								
(FDP)	MISSOURI RIVER, SD, NE, ND, MT	7,743,000	7,127,000	618,000	---	618,000	---	618,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	TENNESSEE								
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF NASHVILLE	4,632,000	3,989,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
	TEXAS								
(N)	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR (42-FOOT PROJECT) (CP&E)	1,170,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	BRAZOS RIV & TRIBS, TX & NM	8,070,000	6,014,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	BUFFALO BAYOU & TRIBUTARIES	6,680,000	6,340,000	302,000	---	302,000	---	302,000	---
(FDP)	CAMERON COUNTY	495,000	200,000	75,000	---	75,000	---	75,000	---
(FDP)	COLORADO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	5,600,000	5,253,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	DICKINSON BAYOU	1,130,000	864,000	255,000	---	255,000	---	255,000	---
(FDP)	HILLEBRANDT BAYOU & TRIBUTARIES	623,000	239,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FDP)	LITTLE CYPRESS CREEK, TX & LA	1,750,000	1,593,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	LITTLE FOSSIL CREEK, VICINITY OF HALTOM CITY	513,000	---	225,000	---	225,000	---	225,000	---
(FDP)	RED RIVER AND TRIBS ABOVE DENISON DAM, TX, OK & NM (REMAINING)	4,380,000	1,204,000	---	---	210,000	---	---	---
(MP)	ROCKLAND LAKE	4,400,000	239,000	---	450,000	---	---	---	---
(FDP)	SAN JACINTO RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	3,330,000	2,892,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	SIMS BAYOU AT HOUSTON (CP&E)	2,070,000	383,000	745,000	---	745,000	---	745,000	---
(N)	TEXAS CITY CHANNEL (50-FOOT PROJECT) (CP&E)	1,570,000	287,000	800,000	---	800,000	---	800,000	---
(MP)	TRINITY RIVER, CHANNEL TO LIBERTY	3,500,000	2,136,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FC)	UPPER WHITE OAK BAYOU & TRIBS, VICINITY OF HOUSTON (CP&E)	3,700,000	2,274,000	745,000	---	745,000	---	745,000	---
	UTAH								
(FDP)	GREAT SALT LAKE	1,250,000	500,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	JORDAN RIVER BASIN	2,670,000	2,335,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	VIRGINIA								
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA (CP&E).....	900,000	360,000	480,000	---	480,000	---	480,000	---
(FDP)	ROANOKE RIVER, UPPER BASIN.....	3,110,000	1,996,000	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(BE)	VIRGINIA BEACH (HURRICANE PROTECTION) (CP&E).....	2,220,000	800,000	900,000	---	900,000	---	900,000	---
	WASHINGTON								
(N)	BELLINGHAM HARBOR.....	365,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	BLAIR AND SITCUM WATERWAYS (CP&E).....	2,600,000	863,000	---	---	450,000	---	---	---
(FC)	CHEHALIS RIVER AT SOUTH ABERDEEN AND COSMOPOLIS (CP&E)	1,097,000	931,000	147,000	---	147,000	---	147,000	---
(FDP)	CHEHALIS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES.....	2,931,000	2,830,000	94,000	---	94,000	---	94,000	---
(N)	EAST WEST & DUWAMISH WW SEATTLE HARBOR (CP&E).....	2,910,000	974,000	750,000	---	750,000	---	750,000	---
(N)	GRAYS HARBOR CHEHALIS AND HOQUIAM RIVERS (CP&E).....	3,860,000	3,046,000	770,000	---	770,000	---	770,000	---
(FDP)	MILL CREEK BASIN STUDY.....	900,000	526,000	260,000	---	260,000	---	260,000	---
(N)	OLYMPIA HARBOR.....	365,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(COMP)	PUGET SOUND AND ADJACENT WATERS.....	8,383,000	6,499,000	351,000	---	351,000	---	351,000	---
	WEST VIRGINIA								
(COMP)	KANAWHA BASIN COMPREHENSIVE (AUTHORIZATION REPORTS), WV,VA & NC.....	5,304,000	4,044,000	175,000	---	175,000	---	475,000	---
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER.....	5,225,000	3,108,000	650,000	---	650,000	---	650,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER POTOMAC RIVER BASIN.....	750,000	---	---	---	---	---	500,000	---
	REVIEW OF AUTHORIZED PROJECTS								
	REVIEW OF COMPLETED PROJECTS (SEC. 216).....	---	---	---	---	550,000	---	---	---
	ALAMO DAM, ARIZ.....	---	---	---	---	(200,000)	---	---	---
	GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX.....	---	---	---	---	(350,000)	---	---	---
	REVIEW FOR DEAUTHORIZATION.....	---	---	200,000	---	---	---	200,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES	---	---	6,750,000	---	6,600,000	---	6,800,000	---
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA								
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	---	---	535,000	---	535,000	---	535,000	---
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)	---	---	380,000	---	380,000	---	380,000	---
	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	---	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	---	---	8,800,000	---	8,800,000	---	6,300,000	---
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	---	---	260,000	---	260,000	---	260,000	---
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	---	---	130,000	---	130,000	---	130,000	---
	COASTAL DATA COLLECTION	---	---	1,800,000	---	1,800,000	---	1,800,000	---
	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	---	---	600,000	---	600,000	---	400,000	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	---	---	235,000	---	235,000	---	235,000	---
	TOTAL			12,840,000	---	12,840,000	---	10,140,000	---
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	---	---	23,000,000	---	23,700,000	---	18,000,000	---
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			121,661,000	5,339,000	142,820,000	6,591,000	119,951,000	6,489,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	---	---	---	---	---	---	-2,200,000	---
	TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			127,000,000		149,411,000		124,240,000	

TYPE OF PROJECT:

(N)	NAVIGATION	(SPEC)	SPECIAL
(FC)	FLOOD CONTROL	(COMP)	COMPREHENSIVE
(BE)	BEACH EROSION CONTROL	(PHASE I)	AUTHORIZD FOR PHASE I STAGE OF ADVANCE
(MP)	MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER		ENGINEERING AND DESIGN IN THE WATER
(FDP)	FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION		RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974 OR
(SP)	SHORELINE PROTECTION		1976

The following table shows each project for which funds are recommended. Immediately following the table, the Committee has outlined special reductions and changes made in the budgeted projects together with selected other Committee actions.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	ALABAMA					
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR	228,980,000	306,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
(FC)	THREEMILE CREEK, MOBILE	9,470,000	62,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	---
(FC)	VILLAGE CREEK	24,000,000	---	---	4,000,000	---
(N)	WILLIAM BACON OLIVER LOCK & DAM REPLACEMENT	65,000,000	2,976,000	10,500,000	10,500,000	10,500,000
	ALASKA					
(FC)	CHENA RIVER LAKES	209,000,000	200,133,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
(MP)	SNETTISHAM	139,000,000	110,158,000	10,800,000	10,800,000	10,800,000
	ARIZONA					
(FC)	PHOENIX ARIZONA AND VICINITY (STAGE 2)	232,000,000	61,996,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000
	ARKANSAS					
(FC)	FOURCHE BAYOU IN THE VICINITY OF LITTLE ROCK	18,260,000	1,646,000	760,000	760,000	---
(N)	MCCLELLAN-KERR ARK RIVER NAV SYSTEM LOCKS AND DAMS, AR & OK	545,590,000	540,149,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(N)	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	272,000,000	210,715,000	7,880,000	9,080,000	9,080,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	CALIFORNIA					
(FC)	CORTE MADERA CREEK	14,000,000	10,259,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE	343,000,000	292,980,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
(FC)	FAIRFIELD VICINITY STREAMS	9,630,000	630,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(N)	FISHERMAN'S WHARF AREA	8,900,000	8,835,000	550,000	550,000	550,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES DRAINAGE AREA (MAJOR REHAB)	29,700,000	18,889,000	8,900,000	8,900,000	8,900,000
(FC)	LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER	5,600,000	3,128,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS	57,900,000	6,530,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(MP)	NEW MELONES LAKE	382,000,000	347,157,000	1,900,000	3,500,000	1,900,000
(N)	OAKLAND OUTER HARBOR	14,900,000	428,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	---
(FC)	PAJARO RIVER	1,820,000	580,000	500,000	500,000	---
(N)	PORT HUENEME HARBOR (UNSTARTED SEPARABLE ELEMENT)	2,501,000	481,000	1,020,000	1,020,000	1,020,000
(FC)	REDBANK AND FANCHER CREEKS	55,200,000	3,460,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	---
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR	19,300,000	797,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	---
(FC)	SACREMENTO RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT	74,950,000	68,165,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT	90,000,000	54,695,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER, CHICO LANDING TO RED BLUFF	30,000,000	10,830,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL	52,700,000	2,020,000	3,600,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER AND MAJOR AND MINOR TRIBUTARIES	11,900,000	11,542,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON	138,000,000	42,701,000	3,900,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
(FC)	SAN LUIS REY RIVER	29,700,000	---	---	1,500,000	---
(FC)	SWEETWATER RIVER	24,600,000	12,867,000	7,200,000	7,200,000	7,200,000
(FC)	WALNUT CREEK	62,800,000	25,316,000	11,100,000	11,100,000	11,100,000
(FC)	WILDCAT AND SAN PABLO CREEKS	17,600,000	1,733,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	COLORADO					
(FC)	CHATFIELD LAKE	95,600,000	93,233,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
(FC)	FOUNTAIN CREEK AT PUEBLO, COLORADO	5,910,000	---	---	1,360,000	---
	DELAWARE					
(FC)	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION,DE,1968 ACT	129,000,000	2,604,000	---	575,000	---
	FLORIDA					
(BE)	BROWARD COUNTY (REIMBURSEMENT)	18,500,000	10,983,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR	26,300,000	6,281,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
(FC)	CENTRAL & SOUTHERN FLORIDA	767,000,000	296,271,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
	CROSS FLORIDA BARGE CANAL (LAND ACQUISITION)	32,000,000	---	---	11,000,000	---
(FC)	DADE COUNTY	48,600,000	31,384,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	DADE COUNTY, NORTH OF HAULOVER BEACH PARK	13,000,000	150,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(BE)	DUVAL COUNTY	16,000,000	9,263,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
(FC)	FOUR RIVER BASINS	187,000,000	72,279,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, MILL COVE	4,000,000	---	2,000,000	2,000,000	---
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR (CLEANUP)	5,000,000	---	---	200,000	---
(BE)	PALM BEACH COUNTY (REIMBURSEMENT)	10,900,000	4,271,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
(BE)	PINELLAS COUNTY	19,100,000	4,163,000	1,600,000	3,000,000	1,600,000
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR BRANCH CHANNELS	42,800,000	931,000	7,400,000	7,400,000	7,400,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	GEORGIA					
(MP)	RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	541,000,000	430,034,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
(M)	SAVANNAH HARBOR	8,235,000	1,150,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
(BE)	TYBEE ISLAND	5,635,000	3,583,000	2,005,000	2,005,000	2,005,000
	GUAM					
(FC)	AGANA RIVER, GUAM	3,860,000	500,000	700,000	700,000	---
	HAWAII					
(FC)	KAHOMA STREAM, MAUI	16,800,000	776,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000
	ILLINOIS					
(M)	BRANDON ROAD LOCK AND DAM, ILLINOIS RIVER (REHAB)	24,400,000	17,174,000	5,470,000	5,470,000	5,470,000
(FC)	KASKASKIA ISLAND DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT	13,200,000	8,707,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
(M)	LOCK & DAM 26, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, ALTON, IL & MO	748,000,000	403,232,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000
(M)	LOCK & DAM 26, SECOND LOCK, IL & MO	140,000,000	1,745,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(M)	LOCKS AND DAM 53, IL & KY (REHAB)	9,240,000	5,190,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
(FC)	MAUVAISE TERRE DRAINAGE & LEVEE DISTRICT	1,100,000	600,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
(FC)	ROCKFORD	10,140,000	8,698,000	950,000	950,000	950,000
(M)	SMITHLAND LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL, IN & KY	275,800,000	272,808,000	486,000	486,000	486,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
(FC)	SOUTH QUINCY LEVEE AND DRAINAGE DISTRICT.....	9,670,000	317,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	---
(N)	UPPER MISS RVR SYSTEM ENVIR MANGMENT PLAN, IL, IA, MO, MN, & WI.....	196,000,000	350,000	1,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
	INDIANA					
(FC)	EVANSVILLE.....	49,800,000	28,657,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
(N)	FALLS OF OHIO NATL WILDLIFE CONSER AREA, IN & KY.....	1,200,000	300,000	---	900,000	---
	IOWA					
(FC)	AMES LAKE.....	56,100,000	394,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
(FC)	BETTENDORF.....	14,500,000	12,779,000	1,618,000	1,618,000	1,618,000
(FC)	DES MOINES RECREATION RIVER AND GREENBELT (DRAG).....	4,750,000	150,000	350,000	350,000	350,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO.....	248,000,000	73,786,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
(FC)	RED ROCK DAM - LAKE RED ROCK.....	42,000,000	---	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	SAYLORVILLE LAKE.....	124,200,000	112,377,000	---	1,000,000	1,000,000
	KANSAS					
(FC)	GREAT BEND.....	43,535,000	2,062,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	---
(FC)	HALSTEAD.....	5,812,000	535,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	---

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	KENTUCKY					
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM & LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)	16,200,000	1,148,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(FC)	BIG SOUTH FORK NATIONAL RIVER AND RECREATION AREA, KY & TN	103,522,000	89,289,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
(FC)	SOUTHWESTERN JEFFERSON COUNTY	57,500,000	42,735,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
(FC)	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE	92,225,000	81,296,000	---	---	1,300,000
(FC)	YATESVILLE LAKE	90,100,000	50,787,000	---	6,800,000	---
	LOUISIANA					
(FC)	GRAND ISLE & VIC,LA SEC 201, 1976 ACT	10,343,000	9,343,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	511,000,000	179,796,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	64,000,000	41,288,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
(M)	MISS RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	357,000,000	57,653,000	19,400,000	21,400,000	19,400,000
(M)	MISS RIVER-GULF OUTLET	491,000,000	87,343,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(M)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE	168,000,000	7,761,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	164,000,000	54,746,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(FC)	PEARL RIVER, SLIDELL, ST. TAMMANY PARISH	17,742,000	55,000	750,000	750,000	750,000
(M)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, LA, AR, OK, & TX	65,300,000	---	---	4,500,000	2,500,000
(M)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT	1,582,000,000	663,056,000	38,000,000	68,000,000	68,000,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	MAINE					
(N)	JONESPORT HARBOR	8,850,000	430,000	4,700,000	4,700,000	4,700,000
	MARYLAND					
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS, MD & VA (50 FT DEEPENING)	174,000,000	3,920,000	54,000,000	54,000,000	54,000,000
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR & CHANNELS (BREWERTON CHANNEL)	43,300,000	27,732,000	5,000,000	6,400,000	5,000,000
	MASSACHUSETTS					
(BE)	REVERE BEACH	5,170,000	485,000	700,000	700,000	---
(FC)	TOWN BROOK, QUINCY, AND BRAINTREE	21,500,000	---	---	2,800,000	---
	MINNESOTA					
(FC)	BASSETT CREEK	26,000,000	1,850,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(FC)	MANKATO AND NORTH MANKATO	95,200,000	76,976,000	8,800,000	8,800,000	8,800,000
	SILVER BAY HARBOR OF REFUGE	---	---	---	675,000	---
(FC)	SOUTH FORK ZUMBRO RIVER AT ROCHESTER	53,000,000	3,119,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	---

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	MISSISSIPPI					
(N)	GULFPORT HARBOR	36,900,000	140,000	800,000	800,000	---
(FC)	SOWASHEE CREEK, MERIDIAN	11,250,000	136,000	900,000	900,000	---
(FC)	TOMBIGBEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MS & AL	50,000,000	18,606,000	4,900,000	4,900,000	4,900,000
	MISSOURI					
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	141,000,000	17,011,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(MP)	CLARENCE CANNON DAM & MARK TWAIN LAKE	330,000,000	311,956,000	---	1,300,000	---
(MP)	HARRY S. TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR	550,000,000	525,318,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES	137,000,000	131,219,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
(FC)	LONG BRANCH LAKE	20,453,000	17,806,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN - FLOOD FORECASTING/ FLOOD WARNING SYSTEM	880,000	550,000	---	330,000	330,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO & IL	181,000,000	69,477,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
	NEBRASKA					
(FC)	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE AND SD	21,000,000	816,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES	48,000,000	45,022,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	NEW HAMPSHIRE					
(N)	PORTSMOUTH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA RIVER, NH & ME.....	14,300,000	---	3,000,000	3,000,000	---
	NEW JERSEY					
(N)	BARNEGAT INLET.....	24,250,000	310,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(N)	CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP.....	17,900,000	---	---	913,000	---
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER IN THE VICINITY OF CAMDEN.....	2,870,000	220,000	2,650,000	2,650,000	---
(FC)	LIBERTY STATE PARK LEVEE AND SEAWALL.....	19,000,000	242,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET.....	138,100,000	2,735,000	---	2,300,000	1,000,000
	NEW MEXICO					
(FDP)	ALBUQUERQUE DIVERSION CHANNELS (DESIGN DEFIC).....	460,000	---	---	---	460,000
(FC)	JEMEZ CANYON DAM (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE).....	3,060,000	957,000	2,060,000	2,060,000	2,060,000
	NEW YORK					
(FC)	ARDSLEY.....	4,430,000	525,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	ELLICOTT CREEK.....	13,500,000	2,009,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(N)	KILL VAN KULL & NEWARK BAY CHANNEL, NY & NJ.....	191,000,000	579,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
(N)	MORICHES INLET.....	5,000,000	1,141,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
(N)	NY HARBOR COLLECTION AND REMOVAL OF DRIFT, NY & NJ....	50,800,000	19,334,000	4,600,000	4,600,000	4,600,000
(N)	PORT ONTARIO.....	2,760,000	830,000	800,000	800,000	800,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	NORTH CAROLINA					
(FC)	B. EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE	136,000,000	111,408,000	8,700,000	8,700,000	8,700,000
(FC)	FALLS LAKE	168,000,000	136,627,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000
(FC)	RANDLEMAN LAKE	111,400,000	4,171,000	---	3,000,000	---
	NORTH DAKOTA					
(FC)	LAKE DARLING, SOURIS RIVER	59,200,000	9,304,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
	OHIO					
(N)	CLEVELAND HARBOR	5,850,000	1,635,000	2,700,000	2,700,000	---
(N)	GENEVA-ON-THE-LAKE	4,610,000	1,040,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FC)	MILL CREEK	156,000,000	40,485,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES (REHAB)	24,900,000	20,108,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
(FC)	NEWARK	9,600,000	6,336,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
	OKLAHOMA					
(FC)	ARCADIA LAKE	84,300,000	72,540,000	5,900,000	5,900,000	5,900,000
	EUFAULA LAKE (BRIDGE REPLACEMENT)	1,700,000	---	---	390,000	---
(FC)	PARKER LAKE	48,960,000	---	---	7,000,000	---
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE	61,003,000	58,806,000	---	300,000	300,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	OREGON					
(N)	BONNEVILLE NAVIGATION LOCK, OR & WA	101,500,000	12,586,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE SECOND POWERHOUSE, OR & WA	663,000,000	640,014,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
(FC)	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR & WA	25,400,000	20,202,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION	29,800,000	24,774,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
	PENNSYLVANIA					
(FC)	COWANESQUE LAKE (MODIFICATION)	2,690,000	1,465,000	470,000	470,000	470,000
(FC)	FRANCIS E. WALTER DAM MODIFICATION	14,400,000	5,688,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	---
(N)	GRAYS LANDING, LOCK & DAM 7, MONONGAHELA RIVER	60,500,000	400,000	670,000	4,200,000	2,500,000
(N)	MONTGOMERY LOCKS AND DAMS, OHIO RIVER (REHAB)	33,200,000	13,806,000	8,300,000	8,300,000	8,300,000
(N)	POINT MARION, LOCK & DAM 8, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA & WV	35,050,000	660,000	730,000	730,000	730,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA	16,291,000	11,703,000	1,210,000	1,210,000	1,210,000
(FC)	TAMAQUA	8,540,000	1,850,000	---	1,340,000	---
(FC)	TURTLE CREEK	17,366,000	15,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
	PUERTO RICO					
(N)	PONCE HARBOR	7,328,000	295,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	---
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS	317,000,000	139,375,000	31,000,000	31,000,000	31,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	TEXAS					
(FC)	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBS-ADDICKS & BARKER DAMS (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)	14,600,000	2,871,000	4,900,000	4,900,000	4,900,000
(FC)	CLEAR CREEK	78,141,000	2,936,000	8,200,000	8,200,000	8,200,000
(FC)	COLORADO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, BOGGY CREEK AT AUSTIN.	15,800,000	992,000	900,000	900,000	900,000
(FC)	COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS	140,000,000	27,491,000	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL (1968 ACT)	58,500,000	39,741,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
(FC)	EL PASO	72,700,000	57,637,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR	70,153,000	1,038,000	9,900,000	9,900,000	9,900,000
(FC)	JOE POOL LAKE	190,000,000	161,119,000	9,700,000	9,700,000	9,700,000
(FC)	LAKE WICHITA, HOLLIDAY CREEK AT WICHITA FALLS	30,000,000	1,430,000	700,000	700,000	---
(N)	MOUTH OF COLORADO RIVER	29,600,000	13,959,000	4,700,000	4,700,000	4,700,000
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE	282,000,000	197,713,000	34,000,000	34,000,000	34,000,000
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT	87,300,000	40,015,000	11,600,000	11,600,000	11,600,000
(FC)	SAN GABRIEL RIVER	125,800,000	101,773,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
(FC)	TAYLORS BAYOU	52,700,000	15,537,000	8,600,000	8,600,000	8,600,000
(FC)	VINCE AND LITTLE VINCE BAYOUS	19,600,000	15,153,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
(N)	WALLISVILLE LAKE TRINITY RIV 1962 ACT NAV	67,700,000	25,726,000	---	100,000	100,000
	UTAH					
(FC)	LITTLE DELL LAKE	50,300,000	975,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	2,900,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	VIRGINIA					
(FC)	HAYSI LAKE	20,900,000	3,000	---	1,000,000	---
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING)	154,460,000	2,858,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
(FC)	RICHMOND	72,200,000	1,194,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
(FC)	VIRGINIA BEACH STREAMS, CANAL NO. TWO	4,600,000	446,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
(BE)	VIRGINIA BEACH (REIMB)	5,500,000	4,399,000	530,000	530,000	530,000
	WASHINGTON					
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH ADDITIONAL UNITS	387,000,000	362,142,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(MP)	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR & ID	177,000,000	114,964,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000
(FC)	MT ST HELENS & VICINITY (INTERIM MEASURES)	51,558,000	41,156,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
(FC)	MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL	148,000,000	7,300,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000
(FC)	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)	23,800,000	1,244,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
	WEST VIRGINIA					
(N)	GALLIPOLIS LOCKS & DAM, WV & OH	176,500,000	2,005,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
(FC)	LEVISA/TUG FORKS OF BIG SANDY & UPPER CUMBERLAND RVRS, WV, VA, & KY	247,000,000	80,795,000	22,500,000	27,900,000	23,200,000
(FC)	R D BAILEY LAKE	250,000,000	215,972,000	33,000,000	33,000,000	33,000,000
(FC)	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE	206,000,000	152,111,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000
(N)	WINFIELD LOCK AND DAM	64,000,000	---	1,750,000	1,750,000	1,750,000

1985 Supplemental New Construction Starts.—The Committee recommendation provides the full amount requested for the water resource projects funded and authorized in the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1985 (Public Law 99–88).

The Committee is aware of administration efforts to make a distinction between various types of projects which could result in delaying the initiation of construction on the navigation projects. In passing Public Law 99–88, the Congress fully intended that these projects would be authorized after May 15, 1986, and for construction to begin after that date if non-Federal interests entered into a cost-sharing agreement. Further, the Committee, based on discussions in resolving this issue, expected and anticipated the good faith effort on the part of the administration to carry out this congressional intent. However, based on testimony and information presented, the Committee is concerned that the administration is not proceeding in good faith to begin construction on these projects as intended.

The Committee has, therefore, included a general provisions directing the Secretary of the Army to initiate construction on those water resource projects contained in Public Law 99–88 on which cost-sharing agreements had been entered into prior to July 1, 1986, or on which no cost-sharing agreement is required. The language does not change the Committee's intent that these water resource projects proceed only under the new cost-sharing conditions spelled out when Congress passed the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1985.

1987 Proposed New Starts.—The President's budget for 1987 included funds to initiate construction on an additional 18 new water resource projects costing over $300,000,000, including 12 unauthorized projects. In acting on the 1987 appropriation bill, the House recommended funding for 29 new starts with an estimated cost of $660,000,000, 17 of which were not authorized.

Due to the constraints imposed by the budget resolution for 1987, the Committee has focused the available resources on ongoing projects in order to minimize schedule delays. The Committee action in not recommending the initiation of new construction starts in 1987 defers, without prejudice, action on the 29 projects included by the House. The Committee feels that this is the best course of action until sufficient budgetary resources are available and the omnibus water bill is enacted, which is necessary if a number of these projects are to proceed.

Elk Creek Lake, OR.—The Committee wishes to reiterate its continuing strong support for the Elk Creek Lake project in Oregon. It should be pointed out that, in response to the fiscal 1986 budget request, Congress appropriated $18,000,000 to initiate an ongoing contract for main dam construction. On January 24, 1986, the Corps of Engineers awarded the contract for construction on the main dam and work is proceeding on schedule. Further, the Corps has testified that currently available funds are sufficient to meet projected needs through 1987 and, therefore, no funding request was included in the 1987 budget.

In light of the Corps' action to award an ongoing contract for main dam construction (and congressional action to appropriate nearly half of the amount required to complete project construction), the Committee expects that sufficient funds be requested to cover anticipated contractor earnings in fiscal year 1988.

Small beach erosion control projects (section 103).—The Committee recommendation includes $700,000 for the Homer, AK, project; and $600,000 each for the Indian River Inlet, North Shore and South Shore projects in Delaware.

John Day Lock and Dam, Oregon and Washington.—The Committee supports the ongoing construction of fish passage facilities at the John Day Lock and Dam, which will ensure the passage of juvenile salmon and steelhead around this project. Therefore, the Committee expects the Corps to transfer available construction funds into the John Day project, if required, to complete the construction of the fish passage facilities.

Taylorsville Lake, KY.—The Committee is aware that the State of Kentucky has now provided their share of funding for recreation development at Taylorsville Lake in Kentucky. Therefore, an amount of $1,300,000 has been included to meet the Federal share for development of the recreation facilities at this project.

Upper Mississippi River Environmental Management Program.—The Committee continues to support the simultaneous development of environmental and navigational improvements of the upper Mississippi River system on an equal fiscal footing. The Committee is aware that funding for the lock and dam is projected to increase significantly in fiscal year 1988 and fiscal year 1989. The Committee also recognizes the need to set up corresponding environmental programs before significant construction on lock and dam 26 begins. Therefore, the Committee urges the Secretary of the Army to use any funds that become available, in addition to the $2,000,000 allocated for the Environmental Management Program [EMP], to meet EMP requirements contained in the master plan for fiscal year 1987.

Lake Darling Project, ND (modification).—The Committee is aware of the efforts to modify the authorized Lake Darling project in North Dakota and that the modification is part of the pending omnibus water authorization bill currently in conference. Further, the Committee understands that the new plan would increase flood control benefits to Minot, ND, substantially.

The Committee, therefore, directs the Secretary of the Army, Departments of State and Treasury, and OMB to coordinate their efforts and develop a plan which would provide for U.S. support and participation, if authorized, in the Saskatchewan, Canada, project. The plan should be submitted to the Committee for review during hearings on the 1988 budget request.

Given the importance of this project and the savings that could be realized, the Committee urges the administration in the strongest way to request U.S. funding of this project.

Chicago Edgewater, IL.—The Committee is aware of the serious erosion problems occurring along the Lake Michigan shoreline in the vicinity of Chicago, IL. In response to the Committees' concerns, the Corps of Engineers completed a report in March 1986, titled "Lake Michigan Shoreline Flooding, Erosion and Lake Related Problems in the Edgewater and Rogers Park Areas of Chicago, Illinois." The report recommends a plan for emergency bank stabilization, shore protection, and flood control work to protect public-owned property in the Edgewater and Rogers Park areas. The recommended work was initiated under the authority of section 123 of Public Law 99–190. The Committee understands that the estimated cost of the project is now $2,300,000 and directs the Corps of Engineers to complete the work recommended in the March 1986 report within available funds, consistent with the provisions of Public Law 99–190.

Papillion Creek and Tributaries Lakes, NE.—With respect to the Papillion Creek and Tributaries Lakes project that would provide flood protection and recreation facilities to the expanding metropolitan area of Omaha, the Committee is aware of the water quality problems associated with dam site 18.

The effluent from two upstream sanitary improvement districts [SID's] is discharged into Boxelder Creek which now feeds the new reservoir. Both facilities have met the conditions of their NPDES discharge permits issued by the State of Nebraska, Department of Environmental Control. With the development of site 18, the State and local health departments have determined the discharge quality is incompatible with the recreational uses of the impounded waters.

The Committee notes that State and local interests have developed a mutually acceptable solution that resolves the water quality problem. The Committee also notes the solution consists of construction of a storage facility to prevent the discharges from reaching site 18, currently estimated to cost $1,086,000.

The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to provide funds for design and construction of the storage facility to include necessary conveyances. The funds are to be provided from funds previously appropriated for the Papillion Creek project.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriations, 1986	$23,925,000
Budget estimate, 1987	25,000,000
House allowance	25,000,000
Committee recommendation	10,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−15,000,000
House allowance	−15,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $10,000,000 for flood control and coastal emergencies.

The funds recommended provide for advance preparation measures associated with flood emergencies, flood fighting and rescue operations, and other emergency work.

Waldport, OR.—The Committee is aware of an adverse flooding situation in the vicinity of Waldport, OR, and directs the Corps of Engineers to work closely with State and local authorities to develop an acceptable solution to the problem.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, AND TENNESSEE

Appropriations, 1986	$301,225,000
Budget estimate, 1987	298,000,000
House allowance	319,460,000
Committee recommendation	300,369,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+2,369,000
House allowance	−19,091,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $300,369,000, which is $19,091,000 below the House allowance and $2,369,000 over the budget request.

De Valls Bluff Pumping Station, AR.—The Committee does not concur with the House in providing authority for the Corps of Engineers to repair the pumping station and gravity outlets at the city of De Valls Bluff, AR. Upon completion of the project construction, local interests signed an agreement to provide for all operation, maintenance, and repair and the project was turned over to the Levee Improvement District for operation. However, subsequent maintenance has not been performed by local sponsors in accordance with the agreement.

In view of the potential for similar requirements at other locations nationwide, the Committee cannot agree with this House provision.

The following table shows the distribution of the funds recommended with the budget request and the House allowance for activities and projects under this heading.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	MISCELLANEOUS					
	SMALL NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107).....	---	---	6,900,000	10,763,000	6,900,000
	MITIGATION OF SHORE DAMAGES ATTRIBUTABLE TO NAVIGATION PROJECTS.....	---	---	300,000	300,000	300,000
	SMALL BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 103)....	---	---	2,100,000	5,408,000	4,000,000
	SMALL PROJECTS FOR FLOOD CONTROL & RELATED PURPOSES (SECTION 205).....	---	---	30,000,000	34,100,000	30,000,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION (SECTION 14).....	---	---	7,500,000	9,400,000	7,500,000
	SMALL SNAGGING & CLEARING PROJECTS (SECTION 208).....	---	---	1,200,000	1,450,000	1,200,000
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL (1965 ACT).....	---	---	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
	EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION.....	---	---	10,973,000	10,973,000	10,973,000
	DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE PROGRAM.....	---	---	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000
	FUNDS DERIVED FROM INLAND WATERWAYS TRUST FUND.....	---	---	26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE.....	---	---	-51,732,000	-51,732,000	-65,282,000
	TOTAL CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL.....			1,072,500,000	1,187,734,000	1,061,260,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:

(N)	NAVIGATION	(FDP)	FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION	(PHASE I) AUTHORIZD FOR PHASE I STAGE OF ADVANCE
(FC)	FLOOD CONTROL	(SP)	SHORELINE PROTECTION	ENGINEERING AND DESIGN IN THE WATER
(BE)	BEACH EROSION CONTROL	(SPEC)	SPECIAL	RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974 OR
(MP)	MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER	(COMP)	COMPREHENSIVE	1976

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS				
SURVEYS:				
GENERAL STUDIES:				
BOEUF-TENSAS BASIN, AR & LA	6,540,000	950,000	950,000	950,000
BUSHLEY BAYOU AREA LA (CP&E)	975,000	150,000	150,000	---
BAYOU DU CHIEN, KY	995,000	243,000	243,000	243,000
LARTO LAKE-SALINE LAKE AREA, LA	1,410,000	116,000	216,000	---
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN (WATER & LAND RESOURCES), LA	6,551,000	170,000	170,000	170,000
MISSISSIPPI & LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, LA & MS (CP&E)	3,900,000	780,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
HORN LAKE CREEK & TRIBS INCLUDING COWPEN CREEK, MS & TN (CP&E)	400,000	---	250,000	---
TUSCUMBIA RIVER BASIN, MS	250,000	---	250,000	---
YAZOO RIVER BASIN, MS	8,880,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
EASTERN ARKANSAS REGION COMPREHENSIVE STUDY, AR	2,350,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
ST JOHNS BAYOU AND NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO (CP&E)	2,800,000	428,000	428,000	428,000
MONCONNAH CR, TN & MS (CP&E)	1,300,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
REELFOOT LAKE, TN	990,000	260,000	260,000	260,000
TIPTONVILLE, TN	355,000	105,000	105,000	105,000
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	---	270,000	270,000	270,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ADVANCE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN:				
EASTERN RAPIDES & SOUTH CENTRAL AVOYELLES, LA....	4,400,000	935,000	1,250,000	1,250,000
EIGHT MILE CREEK,ARK.....	7,570,000	---	---	350,000
L'ANGUILLE RIVER BASIN, AR.....	2,900,000	655,000	655,000	655,000
SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS.....		7,062,000	8,297,000	7,781,000
CONSTRUCTION				
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.....	3,010,000,000	75,100,000	75,100,000	75,100,000
EIGHT MILE CREEK, AR.....	7,570,000	350,000	350,000	---
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.	1,229,000,000	21,700,000	24,200,000	21,700,000
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION SALINITY CONTROL STRUCTURE...	---	---	500,000	---
ST. FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO.....	361,000,000	9,200,000	9,200,000	9,200,000
WEST KENTUCKY TRIBS, KY.....	20,955,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
TENSAS BASIN, AR & LA:	(443,707,000)	(5,600,000)	(5,600,000)	(5,600,000)
BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, EXCEPT LAKE CHICOT PUMPING PLANT.....	133,232,000	560,000	560,000	560,000
BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, LAKE CHICOT PUMPING PLANT	92,300,000	815,000	815,000	815,000
RED RIVER BACKWATER AREA, EXCEPT TENSAS COCODRIE PUMPING PLANT.....	163,775,000	2,725,000	2,725,000	2,725,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
RED RIVER BACKWATER AREA, TENSAS COCODRIE PUMPING PLANT	54,400,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	1,433,000,000	35,600,000	35,600,000	35,600,000
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	131,875,000	970,000	970,000	970,000
BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	19,839,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
OLD RIVER, LA	301,300,000	14,829,000	14,829,000	14,829,000
SARDIS LAKE, MS (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)	9,000,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
YAZOO BASIN, MS:	(1,290,500,000)	(24,000,000)	(33,200,000)	(24,000,000)
BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER	108,000,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
MAIN STEM	169,000,000	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
TRIBUTARIES	242,000,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS (FORMERLY AUXILIARY CHANNEL)	361,958,000	14,200,000	14,200,000	14,200,000
YAZOO BACKWATER	234,500,000	1,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL	13,700,000	---	7,200,000	7,200,000
WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	104,000,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION		196,524,000	208,724,000	205,374,000
MAINTENANCE				
BOEUF-TENSAS BASIN, AR AND LA	---	1,784,000	1,784,000	1,784,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1986	$1,263,248,000
Budget estimate, 1987	1,420,000,000
House allowance	1,417,447,000
Committee recommendation	1,369,418,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−50,582,000
House allowance	−48,029,000

An appropriation of $1,369,418,000 is recommended, which is $48,029,000 below the House allowance.

The Committee is aware of growing operation and maintenance requirements nationwide, and the continuously changing needs and priorities. It is often necessary to accomplish work scheduled for the budget year in the current year, and it is not uncommon for the Corps to divert operation and maintenance funds to unscheduled emergency maintenance requirements.

Further, the Committee is aware of the efforts of the Corps to stretch the scarce O&M dollars to cover all of its projects and to effect savings through a variety of methods. As more and more projects come into the inventory and fiscal constraints reduce budgetary resources, it is clear that the Corps will need to change its traditional approach to undertaking the required O&M work nationwide. Adjustments in lower priority programs and noncritical work should be considered. However, in optimizing its use of the limited resources available, the Corps should insure maximum public benefits for navigation, hydropower, and flood control.

The 1987 budget request was based on estimates which were developed 18 months ago. Maintenance dredging requirements in navigation channels vary with weather conditions, equipment availability, and usage. Further, good bid experience could free up additional dollars to accomplish unscheduled work. Specific allocations impede the Corps' ability to adjust to continuously changing needs. Only if the Corps' financial flexibility to respond to emergencies and other unanticipated urgent requirements is preserved can the Chief of Engineers carry out his responsibility to perform the O&M work of greatest overall importance to the Nation.

Columbia River fish passage facilities.—The Committee is strongly supportive of efforts to insure adequate juvenile salmon and steelhead fish passage facilities on the Columbia and lower Snake River dams. The Committee urges the Corps to provide additional funds, over the amounts identified in the budget, for design and construction of improved fish screens, and holding and loading facilities at the Columbia and Snake River dams.

Inspection of Completed Works, Sacramento River Flood Control Project, CA.—The Committee is aware of the need for a comprehensive analysis of the integrity of the flood control system for the Sacramento River and its tributaries. Given the importance of this flood protection system, the Committee believes that such an analysis is warranted.

The Committee directs the Chief of Engineers to complete necessary technical studies and engineering plans, within the next 6 months, for developing the Little Missouri River Bay Recreational Area. Further, the administration is encouraged to request sufficient funding in a 1987 supplemental for this work.

In addition, the attention of the Corps of Engineers is directed to the following projects in need of maintenance or review and for which the Committee has received requests—the need to correct erosion problems caused by the operation of the Bull Shoals Lake project in Arkansas; the need for including protective bridge fenders as part of the rehabilitation of C&D Canal bridges in Delaware; the need for vegetative clearing along the Black River in Clay and Randolph Counties, AR; the need for additional emergency dredging at Fire Island Inlet, NY; and maintenance dredging in the vicinity of the Port of Lewiston, ID, on the Clearwater River.

The Corps of Engineers should continue to work closely with navigation interests on the Columbia and Snake Rivers navigation system to address safety problems related to tie-off facilities and adequate channel depths, particularly upstream of Ice Harbor Dam and in the McNary Pool.

The Committee recommendation includes $176,000, the same as the budget request, for the Corps of Engineers to implement studies concerning the seepage from Cochiti Dam on to lands of the Cochiti Indian Pueblo with a view to specifically identify the problem and formulate an adequate solution. The Committee action is not intended to prejudice pending litigation or address liability for any damages caused by the operation of the project.

The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to work with the Williston, ND, Vector Control District to identify methods of controlling mosquitos and the reservoir pool level to reduce marsh acreage.

The following table is included for illustrative purposes only and shows the estimated work allowances for fiscal year 1983:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
ALABAMA		
ALABAMA-COOSA RIVERS	4,924,000	4,924,000
BAYOU CODEN	---	---
BLACK WARRIOR & TOMBIGBEE RIVERS	11,948,000	11,948,000
BON SECOUR	---	---
DAUPHIN ISLAND BAY	560,000	560,000
DOG AND FOWL RIVERS	134,000	134,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (MOBILE DISTRICT)	4,567,000	4,567,000
MILLERS FERRY LOCK & DAM - WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY RESERVOIR	3,496,000	3,496,000
MOBILE HARBOR	7,112,000	7,112,000
PERDIDO PASS CHANNEL	562,000	562,000
ROBERT F. HENRY LOCK & DAM	3,220,000	3,220,000
TENNESSEE TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	14,323,000	14,323,000
WALTER F. GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	5,252,000	5,252,000
ALASKA		
ANCHORAGE HARBOR	1,920,000	1,920,000
CHENA RIVER LAKES	797,000	797,000
DILLINGHAM SMALL BOAT HARBOR	423,000	423,000
HOMER HARBOR	306,000	306,000
NINILCHIK SMALL BOAT HARBOR	243,000	243,000
NOME HARBOR	1,029,000	1,029,000
STIKINE RIVER SNAGGING	13,000	13,000
ARIZONA		
ALAMO LAKE	927,000	927,000
PAINTED ROCK DAM	676,000	676,000
WHITLOW RANCH DAM	86,000	86,000
ARKANSAS		
BEAVER LAKE	3,520,000	3,520,000
BLAKELY MOUNTAIN DAM, LAKE OUACHITA	3,219,000	3,219,000
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE	714,000	714,000
BULL SHOALS LAKE	5,431,000	5,431,000
DARDANELLE LOCK & DAM	4,849,000	4,849,000
DEGRAY LAKE	2,757,000	2,757,000
DEQUEEN LAKE	600,000	600,000
DIERKS LAKE	704,000	704,000
GILLHAM LAKE	602,000	602,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
GREERS FERRY LAKE	3,765,000	3,765,000
HELENA HARBOR	410,000	410,000
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARK RIVER NAV SYSTEM LOCKS AND DAMS, AR & OK	20,433,000	20,433,000
MILLWOOD LAKE	1,520,000	1,520,000
NARROWS DAM - LAKE GREESON	2,418,000	2,418,000
NIMROD LAKE	954,000	954,000
NORFORK LAKE	2,932,000	2,932,000
OSCEOLA HARBOR	533,000	533,000
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	5,310,000	5,310,000
OZARK-JETA TAYLOR LOCK & DAM	3,069,000	3,069,000
WHITE RIVER	1,850,000	1,850,000
CALIFORNIA		
BLACK BUTTE LAKE	1,158,000	1,158,000
BUCHANAN DAM - H. V. EASTMAN LAKE	1,350,000	1,350,000
COYOTE VALLEY DAM (LAKE MENDOCINO)	1,567,000	1,567,000
CRESCENT CITY HARBOR	455,000	455,000
DANA POINT HARBOR	355,000	355,000
DRIFT REMOVAL (SF HARBOR & BAY)	1,380,000	1,380,000
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE & CHANNEL	1,772,000	1,772,000
FARMINGTON DAM	117,000	117,000
HIDDEN DAM - HENSLEY LAKE	1,368,000	1,368,000
HUMBOLDT HARBOR & BAY	2,318,000	2,318,000
ISABELLA LAKE	1,880,000	1,880,000
LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL	140,000	140,000
LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBORS	1,457,000	1,457,000
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA	2,240,000	2,240,000
MARINA DEL REY	1,175,000	1,175,000
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS	143,000	143,000
MOJAVE RIVER DAM	172,000	172,000
MOSS LANDING HARBOR	740,000	740,000
NEW HOGAN LAKE	1,145,000	1,145,000
NEW MELONES LAKE	593,000	593,000
NOYO RIVER AND HARBOR	380,000	380,000
OAKLAND HARBOR	1,624,000	1,624,000
OCEANSIDE EXPERIMENTAL SAND BYPASS	1,918,000	1,918,000
OCEANSIDE HARBOR	480,000	480,000
PETALUMA RIVER	3,225,000	3,225,000
PINE FLAT LAKE	1,795,000	1,795,000
RICHMOND HARBOR	1,745,000	1,745,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL	63,000	63,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER & TRIBS (DEBRIS CONTROL)	675,000	675,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER & TRIBS (30 FOOT PROJECT)	545,000	545,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
SAN FRANCISCO BAY-DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE	1,029,000	1,029,000
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR	1,370,000	1,370,000
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER	2,013,000	2,013,000
SAN PABLO BAY & MARE ISLAND STRAIT	4,640,000	4,640,000
SAN RAFAEL CREEK	-	---
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN	1,609,000	1,608,000
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR	800,000	800,000
SANTA CRUZ HARBOR	-	---
SEPULVEDA DAM LACDA	---	---
SUCCESS LAKE	1,086,000	1,086,000
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL	760,000	760,000
TERMINUS DAM (LAKE KAWEAH)	1,188,000	1,188,000
VENTURA MARINA	1,690,000	1,690,000
YUBA RIVER	10,000	10,000
COLORADO		
BEAR CREEK LAKE	319,000	319,000
CHATFIELD LAKE	1,077,000	1,077,000
CHERRY CREEK LAKE	733,000	733,000
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR	1,060,000	1,060,000
TRINIDAD LAKE	519,000	519,000
CONNECTICUT		
BLACK ROCK LAKE	159,000	159,000
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE	197,000	197,000
CONNECTICUT RIVER BELOW HARTFORD	1,668,000	1,668,000
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE	79,000	79,000
HOP BROOK LAKE	421,000	421,000
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE	300,000	300,000
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE	113,000	113,000
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER	118,000	118,000
THOMASTON DAM	204,000	204,000
WEST THOMPSON LAKE	348,000	348,000
DELAWARE		
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE RIVER TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, DE & MD	21,096,000	21,096,000
IWW REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY	30,000	30,000
MISPILLION RIVER	325,000	325,000
MURDERKILL RIVER	335,000	335,000
WILMINGTON HARBOR	9,794,000	9,794,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
DIST OF COLUMBIA		
POTOMAC & ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL)	470,000	470,000
WASHINGTON HARBOR	32,000	32,000
FLORIDA		
APALACHICOLA BAY	714,000	714,000
BLACKWATER RIVER	504,000	504,000
CANAVERAL HARBOR	6,391,000	6,391,000
CENTRAL & SOUTHERN FLORIDA	5,588,000	5,588,000
CHARLOTTE HARBOR	3,145,000	3,145,000
CROSS-FLORIDA BARGE CANAL	1,439,000	1,439,000
EAST PASS CHANNEL	444,000	444,000
ESCAMBIA-CONECUH RIVERS	625,000	625,000
FERNANDINA HARBOR	2,125,000	2,125,000
FORT PIERCE HARBOR	1,055,000	1,055,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE RIVER TO ANCLOTE RIVER	2,182,000	2,182,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI	3,778,000	3,778,000
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR	3,772,000	3,772,000
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA.	4,818,000	4,818,000
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY	1,960,000	1,960,000
OKLAWAHA RIVER	40,000	40,000
PALM BEACH HARBOR	1,360,000	1,360,000
PANAMA CITY HARBOR	1,105,000	1,105,000
PENSACOLA HARBOR	667,000	667,000
PONCE DE LEON INLET	2,474,000	2,474,000
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH	2,738,000	2,738,000
ST LUCIE INLET	1,115,000	1,115,000
TAMPA HARBOR	3,425,000	3,425,000
GEORGIA		
ALLATOONA LAKE	4,561,000	4,561,000
APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE, FLINT RIVERS, GA, FL & AL	4,522,000	4,522,000
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (SAVANNAH DISTRICT)	600,000	600,000
BRUNSWICK HARBOR	4,253,000	4,253,000
BUFORD DAM, LAKE SIDNEY LANIER	5,959,000	5,959,000
CARTERS LAKE	2,780,000	2,780,000
CLARKS HILL LAKE, GA & SC	5,680,000	5,680,000
HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	5,757,000	5,757,000
RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM & LAKE, GA & SC	3,375,000	3,375,000
SAVANNAH HARBOR	7,574,000	7,574,000
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA	367,000	367,000
WEST POINT LAKE, GA & AL	3,598,000	3,598,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
HAWAII		
BARBERS POINT HARBOR, OAHU	61,000	61,000
NAWILIWILI HARBOR	1,725,000	1,725,000
IDAHO		
ALBENI FALLS DAM	2,026,000	2,026,000
DWORSHAK DAM & RESERVOIR	7,005,000	7,005,000
LUCKY PEAK LAKE	918,000	918,000
ILLINOIS		
CALUMET HARBOR & RIVER, IL & IN	467,000	467,000
CARLYLE LAKE	2,746,000	2,746,000
CHICAGO HARBOR	3,505,000	3,505,000
CHICAGO RIVER	3,113,000	3,113,000
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS	119,000	119,000
ILLINOIS WATERWAY	29,428,000	29,428,000
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (LMVD PORTION)	1,265,000	1,265,000
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION	1,314,000	1,314,000
LAKE SHELBYVILLE	3,856,000	3,856,000
MISS RIV BTWN MISSOURI RIV & MINNEAPOLIS, IL, MN, WI, & IA (MCD)	56,243,000	56,243,000
MISS RIV BTWN MO RIVER & MINNEAPOLIS (LMVD)	8,978,000	8,978,000
NORTH BRANCH CHICAGO RIVER	---	---
REND LAKE	2,690,000	2,690,000
WAUKEGAN HARBOR	1,195,000	1,195,000
INDIANA		
BROOKVILLE LAKE	366,000	366,000
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR	1,108,000	1,108,000
BURNS WATERWAY SMALL BOAT HARBOR	55,000	55,000
CAGLES MILL LAKE	321,000	321,000
CECIL M. HARDEN LAKE	365,000	365,000
HUNTINGTON LAKE	398,000	398,000
INDIANA HARBOR	10,070,000	10,070,000
MISSISSINEWA LAKE	377,000	377,000
MONROE LAKE	346,000	346,000
PATOKA LAKE	372,000	372,000
SALAMONIE LAKE	346,000	346,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
BATON ROUGE HARBOR (DEVIL'S SWAMP), LA	---	285,000	285,000	285,000
DEVALLS BLUFF PUMPING STATION, AR	---	---	250,000	---
WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	---	677,000	677,000	677,000
MEMPHIS HARBOR (MCKELLAR LAKE), TN	---	1,080,000	1,080,000	1,080,000
MAPPING, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	---	662,000	662,000	662,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	---	7,395,000	7,395,000	7,395,000
NORTH BANK, ARKANSAS RIVER, AR	---	15,000	15,000	15,000
SOUTH BANK, ARKANSAS RIVER, AR	---	42,000	42,000	42,000
ST. FRANCIS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, AR & MO	---	3,719,000	3,719,000	3,719,000
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	---	7,797,000	7,797,000	7,797,000
BAYOU COCODRIE & TRIBUTARIES, LA	---	115,000	115,000	115,000
BONNET CARRE SPILLWAY, LA	---	436,000	436,000	436,000
LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	---	62,000	62,000	62,000
OLD RIVER, LA	---	5,814,000	5,814,000	5,814,000
RED RIVER BACKWATER AREA, LA	---	1,327,000	1,327,000	1,327,000
ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	---	2,031,000	2,906,000	2,031,000
BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	---	94,000	94,000	94,000
ENID LAKE, MS	---	2,300,000	3,703,000	2,300,000
GREENWOOD, MS	---	475,000	475,000	475,000
GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS	---	424,000	424,000	424,000
GRENADA LAKE, MS	---	3,292,000	4,170,000	3,292,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
YAZOO BASIN, MAIN STEM, MS	---	1,502,000	1,502,000	1,502,000
SARDIS LAKE, MS	---	3,065,000	7,684,000	3,065,000
VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	---	319,000	319,000	319,000
YAZOO BASIN, TRIBUTARIES, MS	---	1,143,000	1,143,000	1,143,000
WHITTINGTON AUXILIARY CHANNEL, MS	---	57,000	57,000	57,000
YAZOO BACKWATER, MS	---	287,000	287,000	287,000
YAZOO CITY, MS	---	330,000	330,000	330,000
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	---	2,771,000	2,771,000	2,771,000
REVETMENT AND DIKES	---	35,138,000	35,138,000	35,138,000
DREDGING	---	19,343,000	19,343,000	19,343,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	---	1,060,000	1,060,000	1,060,000
SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE		104,841,000	112,866,000	104,841,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS, SLIPPAGE, AND PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.....	---	-10,427,000	-10,427,000	-17,627,000
TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER & TRIBUTARIES.		298,000,000	319,460,000	300,369,000

TYPE OF STUDY OR PROJECT:

(FC) FLOOD CONTROL

(FDP) FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTIUN

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
IOWA		
CORALVILLE LAKE	3,110,000	3,110,000
MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA & NE	2,722,000	2,722,000
MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA & NE	6,206,000	6,206,000
RATHBUN LAKE	1,212,000	1,212,000
RED ROCK DAM - LAKE RED ROCK	3,317,000	3,317,000
SAYLORVILLE LAKE	3,585,000	3,585,000
KANSAS		
CLINTON LAKE	1,198,000	1,198,000
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE	702,000	702,000
EL DORADO LAKE	415,000	415,000
ELK CITY LAKE	560,000	560,000
FALL RIVER LAKE	645,000	645,000
HILLSDALE LAKE	581,000	581,000
JOHN REDMOND DAM & RESERVOIR	875,000	875,000
KANOPOLIS LAKE	1,670,000	1,670,000
MARION LAKE	691,000	691,000
MELVERN LAKE	1,187,000	1,187,000
MILFORD LAKE	1,784,000	1,784,000
PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE	713,000	713,000
PERRY LAKE	1,284,000	1,284,000
POMONA LAKE	1,088,000	1,088,000
TORONTO LAKE	238,000	238,000
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE	2,990,000	2,990,000
WILSON LAKE	1,707,000	1,707,000
KENTUCKY		
BARKLEY DAM - LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	3,725,000	3,725,000
BARREN RIVER LAKE	1,140,000	1,140,000
BIG SANDY HARBOR	1,000,000	1,000,000
BUCKHORN LAKE	660,000	660,000
CARR FORK LAKE	786,000	786,000
CAVE RUN LAKE	517,000	517,000
DEWEY LAKE	737,000	737,000
FISHTRAP LAKE	703,000	703,000
GRAYSON LAKE	535,000	535,000
GREEN & BARREN RIVERS, KY & TN	1,015,000	1,015,000
GREEN RIVER LAKE	893,000	893,000
HICKMAN HARBOR	445,000	445,000
KENTUCKY RIVER	843,000	843,000
LAUREL RIVER LAKE	900,000	900,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
LICKING RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK	11,000	11,000
MARTINS FORK LAKE	486,000	486,000
MIDDLESBORO	212,000	212,000
NOLIN LAKE	2,322,000	2,322,000
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, PA, WV, OH, IN & IL	35,103,000	35,103,000
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, PA, WV, OH, IN, & IL	4,657,000	4,657,000
PAINTSVILLE LAKE	456,000	456,000
ROUGH RIVER LAKE	1,098,000	1,098,000
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE	477,000	477,000
WOLF CREEK DAM - LAKE CUMBERLAND	3,132,000	3,132,000
LOUISIANA		
ATCH RIVER & BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF & BLACK	11,940,000	11,940,000
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY	722,000	722,000
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR	302,000	302,000
BAYOU PIERRE	10,000	10,000
BAYOU TECHE	640,000	640,000
CADDO LAKE	86,000	86,000
CALCASIEU RIVER & PASS	8,395,000	8,395,000
FRESHWATER BAYOU	1,425,000	1,425,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA & TX SECTION	11,664,000	11,664,000
HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL	1,620,000	1,620,000
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR	356,000	356,000
MADISON PARISH PORT	227,000	227,000
MERMENTAU RIVER	420,000	420,000
MISS RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE	2,252,000	2,252,000
MISS RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	33,225,000	33,225,000
MISS RIVER-GULF OUTLET	6,140,000	6,140,000
RED RIVER WATERWAY MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT	2,262,000	2,262,000
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH	1,388,000	1,388,000
WALLACE LAKE	136,000	136,000
MARYLAND		
BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS	12,511,000	12,511,000
BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	85,000	85,000
BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL)	225,000	225,000
BLOOMINGTON LAKE, MD & WV	1,022,000	1,022,000
CHESTER RIVER	467,000	467,000
CLAIBORNE HARBOR	463,000	463,000
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV, MD & WV	64,000	64,000
FISHING CREEK	423,000	423,000
NANTICOKE RIVER NORTHWEST FORK	733,000	733,000
OCEAN CITY HARBOR & INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY	494,000	494,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
TRED AVON RIVER	1,165,000	1,165,000
WICOMICO RIVER	941,000	941,000
MASSACHUSETTS		
BARRE FALLS DAM	305,000	305,000
BIRCH HILL DAM	309,000	309,000
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE	308,000	308,000
CAPE COD CANAL	8,570,000	8,570,000
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREAS	166,000	166,000
CONANT BROOK LAKE	142,000	142,000
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE	302,000	302,000
GREEN HARBOR	191,000	191,000
HODGES VILLAGE DAM	316,000	316,000
KNIGHTVILLE DAM	356,000	356,000
LITTLEVILLE LAKE	267,000	267,000
NEW BEDFORD, FAIRHAVEN & ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER	132,000	132,000
TULLY LAKE	308,000	308,000
WEST HILL DAM	225,000	225,000
WESTVILLE LAKE	345,000	345,000
MICHIGAN		
ARCADIA HARBOR	171,000	171,000
BOLLES HARBOR	55,000	55,000
CASEVILLE HARBOR	167,000	167,000
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST. CLAIR	157,000	157,000
CHARLEVOIX HARBOR	622,000	622,000
CLINTON RIVER (DIKED DISPOSAL)	800,000	800,000
DETROIT RIVER	7,397,000	7,397,000
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR & GRAND RIVER	684,000	684,000
HARBOR BEACH HARBOR	179,000	179,000
HARRISVILLE HARBOR	261,000	261,000
HOLLAND HARBOR	811,000	811,000
INLAND ROUTE	21,000	21,000
KEWEENAW WATERWAY	897,000	897,000
KEWEENAW WATERWAY (DIKED DISPOSAL)	3,100,000	3,100,000
LELAND HARBOR	90,000	90,000
LEXINGTON HARBOR	347,000	347,000
LITTLE LAKE HARBOR	234,000	234,000
LUDINGTON HARBOR	1,360,000	1,360,000
MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI (DIKED DISPOSAL)	110,000	110,000
MONROE HARBOR	1,878,000	1,878,000
MUSKEGON HARBOR	463,000	463,000
ONTONAGON HARBOR	253,000	253,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
PENTWATER HARBOR	212,000	212,000
PORT SANILAC	155,000	155,000
ROUGE RIVER	1,115,000	1,115,000
SAGINAW RIVER (DIKED DISPOSAL)	6,840,000	6,840,000
SAGINAW RIVER	4,211,000	4,211,000
SEBEWAING RIVER	25,000	25,000
ST. CLAIR RIVER	847,000	847,000
ST. JOSEPH HARBOR	899,000	899,000
ST. MARYS RIVER	10,070,000	10,070,000
WHITE LAKE HARBOR	225,000	225,000
MINNESOTA		
BIG STONE LAKE AND WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	316,000	316,000
DULUTH-SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	5,471,000	5,471,000
LAC QUI PARLE LAKE	483,000	483,000
LAKE TRAVERSE AND BOIS DE SIOUX RIVER, MN & SD	241,000	241,000
MINNESOTA RIVER	444,000	444,000
ORWELL LAKE	209,000	209,000
RED LAKE RIVER	61,000	61,000
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER	1,824,000	1,824,000
ST CROIX RIVER MINNESOTA & WISCONSIN	154,000	154,000
WINONA COMMERCIAL HARBOR	20,000	20,000
MISSISSIPPI		
ARKABUTLA LAKE	100,000	100,000
BILOXI HARBOR	1,352,000	1,352,000
CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT	272,000	272,000
GULFPORT HARBOR	3,193,000	3,193,000
MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER	106,000	106,000
OKATIBBEE LAKE	1,056,000	1,056,000
PASCAGOULA HARBOR	3,631,000	3,631,000
PEARL RIVER BASIN, MS & LA	116,000	116,000
ROSEDALE HARBOR	311,000	311,000
SARDIS LAKE	111,000	111,000
TOMBIGBEE RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, EAST FORK	340,000	340,000
WOLF AND JORDAN RIVERS	500,000	500,000
YAZOO RIVER	3,000	3,000
MISSOURI		
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR	410,000	410,000
CLARENCE CANNON DAM & RESERVOIR	3,648,000	3,648,000
CLEARWATER LAKE	3,074,000	3,074,000
HARRY S. TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR	5,646,000	5,646,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES	254,000	254,000
LONG BRANCH LAKE	718,000	718,000
MERAMEC PARK LAKE	599,000	599,000
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO & IL	10,594,000	10,594,000
POMME DE TERRE LAKE	1,400,000	1,400,000
SMITHVILLE LAKE	726,000	726,000
STOCKTON LAKE	2,121,000	2,121,000
TABLE ROCK LAKE	4,017,000	4,017,000
WAPPAPELLO LAKE	169,000	169,000
MONTANA		
FORT PECK LAKE	1,817,000	1,817,000
LIBBY DAM (LAKE KOOCANUSA)	3,856,000	3,856,000
NEBRASKA		
GAVINS POINT DAM LEWIS & CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	6,106,000	6,106,000
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE	1,053,000	1,053,000
MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD	---	---
MISSOURI RIVER, KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY IA&NE.	50,000	50,000
PAPILLION CREEK & TRIBUTARIES LAKES	421,000	421,000
SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES	526,000	526,000
NEVADA		
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	292,000	292,000
PINE & MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES	100,000	100,000
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
BLACKWATER DAM	299,000	299,000
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE	342,000	342,000
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM	564,000	564,000
HOPKINTON-EVERETT LAKES	731,000	731,000
OTTER BROOK LAKE	391,000	391,000
RYE HARBOR	240,000	240,000
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE	408,000	408,000
NEW JERSEY		
BARNEGAT INLET	487,000	487,000
COLD SPRING INLET	122,000	122,000
DELAWARE RIVER BETWEEN PHILADELPHIA AND TRENTON, NJ & PA	4,660,000	4,660,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY	3,290,000	3,290,000
NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK & PASSAIC RIVERS	2,021,000	2,021,000
SALEM RIVER	718,000	718,000
NEW MEXICO		
ABIQUIU DAM	1,063,000	1,063,000
COCHITI LAKE	1,273,000	1,273,000
CONCHAS LAKE	1,201,000	1,201,000
GALISTEO DAM	141,000	141,000
JEMEZ CANYON DAM	233,000	233,000
SANTA ROSA DAM & LAKE	516,000	516,000
TWO RIVERS DAM	242,000	242,000
NEW YORK		
ALMOND LAKE	268,000	268,000
ARKPORT DAM	157,000	157,000
BAY RIDGE & RED HOOK CHANNELS	1,935,000	1,935,000
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL & TONAWANDA HARBOR	2,257,000	2,257,000
BUFFALO HARBOR	1,638,000	1,638,000
EAST SIDNEY LAKE	277,000	277,000
FIRE ISLAND TO JONES INLET	1,650,000	1,650,000
HUDSON RIVER	5,282,000	5,282,000
JONES INLET	2,142,000	2,142,000
LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY	1,290,000	1,290,000
MT. MORRIS LAKE	956,000	956,000
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, NY & VT	36,000	36,000
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY & NJ	2,732,000	2,732,000
NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL)	2,845,000	2,845,000
NEW YORK HARBOR	6,161,000	6,161,000
NEW YORK HARBOR, (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	569,000	569,000
OSWEGO HARBOR	817,000	817,000
ROCHESTER HARBOR	827,000	827,000
RONDOUT HARBOR	1,500,000	1,500,000
SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS	440,000	440,000
WHITNEY POINT LAKE	232,000	232,000
NORTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (WILMINGTON DISTRICT)	4,029,000	4,029,000
B. EVERETT JORDAN DAM & LAKE	771,000	771,000
BEAUFORT HARBOR	355,000	355,000
BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL	250,000	250,000
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON	476,000	476,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
CAROLINA BEACH INLET	527,000	527,000
CHANNEL FROM BACK SOUND TO LOOKOUT BIGHT	224,000	224,000
FALLS LAKE	1,046,000	1,046,000
LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER	485,000	485,000
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY	5,688,000	5,688,000
MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS	19,000	19,000
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR	4,260,000	4,260,000
NEW RIVER INLET	337,000	337,000
NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS	337,000	337,000
SILVER LAKE HARBOR	519,000	519,000
W. KERR SCOTT DAM & RESERVOIR	1,212,000	1,212,000
WILMINGTON HARBOR	4,815,000	4,815,000
NORTH DAKOTA		
BOWMAN - HALEY LAKE	406,000	406,000
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA	9,451,000	9,451,000
HOMME LAKE AND DAM	79,000	79,000
LAKE ASHTABULA & BALDHILL DAM	490,000	490,000
PIPESTEM LAKE	326,000	326,000
OHIO		
ALUM CREEK LAKE	511,000	511,000
ASHTABULA HARBOR	562,000	562,000
BERLIN LAKE	864,000	864,000
CAESAR CREEK LAKE	556,000	556,000
CLARENCE J. BROWN DAM	369,000	369,000
CLEVELAND HARBOR	5,359,000	5,359,000
CONNEAUT HARBOR	777,000	777,000
DEER CREEK LAKE	382,000	382,000
DELAWARE LAKE	337,000	337,000
DILLON LAKE	262,000	262,000
FAIRPORT HARBOR	872,000	872,000
HURON HARBOR	862,000	862,000
LORAIN HARBOR	1,377,000	1,377,000
MASSILLON	15,000	15,000
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN DAM & RESERVOIR	491,000	491,000
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE	723,000	723,000
MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES	4,313,000	4,313,000
NEWARK	15,000	15,000
NORTH BRANCH OF KOKOSING RIVER LAKE	153,000	153,000
PAINT CREEK LAKE	758,000	758,000
ROSEVILLE	15,000	15,000
SANDUSKY HARBOR	1,279,000	1,279,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
TOLEDO HARBOR	4,599,000	4,599,000
TOM JENKINS DAM	242,000	242,000
WEST FORK MILL CREEK LAKE	258,000	258,000
WILLIAM H. HARSHA LAKE	448,000	448,000
OKLAHOMA		
ARCADIA LAKE	79,000	79,000
BIRCH LAKE	593,000	593,000
BROKEN BOW LAKE	1,558,000	1,558,000
CANTON LAKE	1,133,000	1,133,000
COPAN LAKE	449,000	449,000
EUFAULA LAKE	3,087,000	3,087,000
FORT GIBSON LAKE	2,461,000	2,461,000
FORT SUPPLY LAKE	616,000	616,000
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE	340,000	340,000
HEYBURN LAKE	486,000	486,000
HUGO LAKE	1,095,000	1,095,000
HULAH LAKE	543,000	543,000
KAW LAKE	1,332,000	1,332,000
KEYSTONE LAKE	2,362,000	2,362,000
OOLOGAH LAKE	1,240,000	1,240,000
OPTIMA LAKE	496,000	496,000
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR - LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES	7,000	7,000
PINE CREEK LAKE	679,000	679,000
ROBERT S. KERR LOCK, DAM & RESERVOIR	3,257,000	3,257,000
SARDIS LAKE	548,000	548,000
SKIATOOK LAKE	762,000	762,000
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE	2,571,000	2,571,000
WAURIKA LAKE	927,000	927,000
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK & DAM	2,622,000	2,622,000
WISTER LAKE	486,000	486,000
OREGON		
APPLEGATE LAKE	679,000	679,000
BLUE RIVER LAKE	616,000	616,000
BONNEVILLE LOCK & DAM	13,128,000	13,128,000
CHETCO RIVER	502,000	502,000
COLUMBIA AND LWR WILLAMETTE RIVS BELOW VANCVR & PORT, OR & WA	10,351,000	10,351,000
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	7,816,000	7,816,000
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER AND THE DALLES, OR & WA	321,000	321,000
COOS & MILLICOMA RIVERS	131,000	131,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
COOS BAY	2,351,000	2,351,000
COQUILLE RIVER	279,000	279,000
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE	937,000	937,000
COUGAR LAKE	870,000	870,000
DETROIT LAKE	1,543,000	1,543,000
DORENA LAKE	618,000	618,000
FALL CREEK LAKE	387,000	387,000
FERN RIDGE DAM & LAKE	1,271,000	1,271,000
GREEN PETER-FOSTER LAKES	2,001,000	2,001,000
HILLS CREEK LAKE	567,000	567,000
JOHN DAY LOCK & DAM, OR & WA	11,858,000	11,858,000
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE	2,475,000	2,475,000
LOST CREEK LAKE	2,326,000	2,326,000
MCNARY LOCK & DAM, LAKE WALLULA, OR & WA	11,349,000	11,349,000
PORT ORFORD	359,000	359,000
ROGUE RIVER HARBOR AT GOLD BEACH	429,000	429,000
SIUSLAW RIVER	399,000	399,000
SKIPANON CHANNEL	229,000	229,000
UMPQUA RIVER	826,000	826,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION	70,000	70,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER AND WILLAMETTE FALLS	512,000	512,000
WILLOW CREEK LAKE	341,000	341,000
YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR	1,326,000	1,326,000
PENNSYLVANIA		
ALLEGHENY RIVER	5,252,000	5,252,000
ALVIN R. BUSH DAM	305,000	305,000
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE	125,000	125,000
BELTZVILLE LAKE	639,000	639,000
BLUE MARSH LAKE	1,211,000	1,211,000
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE	513,000	513,000
COWANESQUE LAKE	828,000	828,000
CROOKED CREEK LAKE	1,175,000	1,175,000
CURWENSVILLE LAKE	335,000	335,000
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, PA, NJ & DE	20,146,000	20,146,000
EAST BRANCH, CLARION RIVER LAKE	560,000	560,000
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM	384,000	384,000
FRANCIS E. WALTER DAM	508,000	508,000
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM & RESERVOIR	159,000	159,000
JOHNSTOWN	7,000	7,000
KINZUA DAM & ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA & NY	763,000	763,000
LOYALHANNA LAKE	729,000	729,000
MAHONING CREEK LAKE	545,000	545,000
PROMPTON LAKE	259,000	259,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
PUNXSUTAWNEY	7,000	7,000
RAYSTOWN LAKE	1,954,000	1,954,000
SCHUYLKILL RIVER	3,227,000	3,227,000
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA & OH	1,370,000	1,370,000
STILLWATER LAKE	202,000	202,000
TIOGA-HAMMOND LAKES	1,351,000	1,351,000
TIONESTA LAKE	1,048,000	1,048,000
UNION CITY LAKE	514,000	514,000
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE	553,000	553,000
YORK, INDIAN ROCK DAM	310,000	310,000
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA & MD	1,132,000	1,132,000
SOUTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (CHARLESTON DISTRICT)	3,372,000	3,372,000
CHARLESTON HARBOR	5,745,000	5,745,000
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR	4,125,000	4,125,000
FOLLY RIVER	320,000	320,000
GEORGETOWN HARBOR	2,314,000	2,314,000
LITTLE RIVER INLET, SC & NC	228,000	228,000
MURRELLS INLET	725,000	725,000
SHIPYARD RIVER	482,000	482,000
TOWN CREEK	340,000	340,000
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG BEND DAM - LAKE SHARPE	3,892,000	3,892,000
COLD BROOK LAKE	140,000	140,000
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE	119,000	119,000
FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE	6,346,000	6,346,000
OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	7,547,000	7,547,000
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL LAKE	2,304,000	2,304,000
CHEATHAM LOCK & DAM	2,922,000	2,922,000
CORDELL HULL DAM & RESERVOIR	2,564,000	2,564,000
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN & KY	2,359,000	2,359,000
J. PERCY PRIEST DAM & RESERVOIR	1,845,000	1,845,000
OLD HICKORY LOCK & DAM	3,804,000	3,804,000
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN, AL, & KY	8,416,000	8,416,000
WOLF RIVER HARBOR	603,000	603,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
TEXAS		
AQUILLA LAKE	441,000	441,000
ARKANSAS-RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL (AREA 8)	461,000	461,000
BARDWELL LAKE	743,000	743,000
BELTON LAKE	2,476,000	2,476,000
BENBROOK LAKE	1,080,000	1,080,000
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR	2,920,000	2,920,000
BUFFALO BAYOU & TRIBUTARIES	650,000	650,000
CANYON LAKE	1,155,000	1,155,000
CHANNEL TO ARANSAS PASS - GIWW	800,000	800,000
CHANNEL TO VICTORIA - GIWW	190,000	190,000
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL (1968 ACT)	2,730,000	2,730,000
DENISON DAM - LAKE TEXOMA, TX & OK	4,304,000	4,304,000
DOUBLE BAYOU	600,000	600,000
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM - LAKE O' THE PINES	1,606,000	1,606,000
FREEPORT HARBOR	4,480,000	4,480,000
GALVESTON HARBOR & CHANNEL	1,640,000	1,640,000
GRANGER LAKE	1,174,000	1,174,000
GRAPEVINE LAKE	1,523,000	1,523,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY	13,127,000	13,127,000
HORDS CREEK LAKE	762,000	762,000
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL	11,790,000	11,790,000
JOE POOL LAKE	351,000	351,000
LAKE KEMP	135,000	135,000
LAVON LAKE	1,895,000	1,895,000
LEWISVILLE DAM	1,893,000	1,893,000
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL	830,000	830,000
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE	855,000	855,000
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN	919,000	919,000
O. C. FISHER DAM & LAKE	948,000	948,000
PAT MAYSE LAKE	801,000	801,000
PROCTOR LAKE	942,000	942,000
RAY ROBERTS LAKE	136,000	136,000
SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY	14,310,000	14,310,000
SAM RAYBURN DAM & RESERVOIR	2,872,000	2,872,000
SOMERVILLE LAKE	1,985,000	1,985,000
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM	1,035,000	1,035,000
TEXAS CITY CHANNEL	2,160,000	2,160,000
TOWN BLUFF DAM & B.A. STEINHAGEN LAKE	716,000	716,000
WACO LAKE	1,431,000	1,431,000
WALLISVILLE LAKE	205,000	205,000
WHITNEY LAKE	1,850,000	1,850,000
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM & LAKE	1,563,000	1,563,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
VERMONT		
BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE	341,000	341,000
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE	248,000	248,000
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE	439,000	439,000
TOWNSHEND LAKE	337,000	337,000
UNION VILLAGE DAM	309,000	309,000
VIRGINIA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY	1,972,000	1,972,000
CAPE CHARLES CITY HARBOR	1,392,000	1,392,000
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET	836,000	836,000
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW	846,000	846,000
HAMPTON ROADS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL)	190,000	190,000
JAMES RIVER	1,198,000	1,198,000
JOHN H. KERR DAM & RESERVOIR, VA & NC	4,691,000	4,691,000
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN DAM & RESERVOIR	562,000	562,000
LYNNHAVEN INLET,VA	614,000	614,000
NORFOLK HARBOR	5,886,000	5,886,000
NORFOLK HARBOR, (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	294,000	294,000
NORTH FORK OF POUND LAKE	467,000	467,000
PHILPOTT LAKE	1,420,000	1,420,000
TANGIER CHANNEL	375,000	375,000
THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL,VA	1,021,000	1,021,000
WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA	1,659,000	1,659,000
YORK RIVER	720,000	720,000
WASHINGTON		
ANACORTES HARBOR	103,000	103,000
BELLINGHAM HARBOR	411,000	411,000
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM	6,480,000	6,480,000
COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR	666,000	666,000
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK & SAND ISLAND	444,000	444,000
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER	607,000	607,000
GRAYS HARBOR & CHEHALIS RIVER	4,537,000	4,537,000
HOWARD A. HANSON RESERVOIR	734,000	734,000
ICE HARBOR LOCK & DAM	5,822,000	5,822,000
LAKE CROCKETT (KEYSTONE HARBOR)	299,000	299,000
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL	3,278,000	3,278,000
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK & DAM, LAKE BRYAN	4,707,000	4,707,000
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA & ID	6,906,000	6,906,000
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK & DAM	4,507,000	4,507,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
MILL CREEK LAKE	340,000	340,000
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM	1,081,000	1,081,000
OLYMPIA HARBOR	114,000	114,000
PORT TOWNSEND	52,000	52,000
PUGET SOUND & ITS TRIBUTARY WATERS	627,000	627,000
QUILLAYUTE RIVER	694,000	694,000
SEATTLE HARBOR	466,000	466,000
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER	100,000	100,000
SWINOMISH CHANNEL	206,000	206,000
TACOMA - PUYALLUP RIVER	35,000	35,000
TACOMA HARBOR	26,000	26,000
THE DALLES LOCK & DAM, LAKE CELILO, WA & OR	7,099,000	7,099,000
WW CON PT TOWNSEND & OAK BAY	52,000	52,000
WYNOOCHEE LAKE	1,405,000	1,405,000
WEST VIRGINIA		
BEECH FORK LAKE	558,000	558,000
BLUESTONE LAKE	677,000	677,000
BURNSVILLE LAKE	722,000	722,000
EAST LYNN LAKE	709,000	709,000
ELK RIVER HARBOR	250,000	250,000
ELKINS	21,000	21,000
KANAWHA RIVER	6,735,000	6,735,000
MONONGAHELA RIVER, WV, MD & PA	13,353,000	13,353,000
R. D. BAILEY LAKE	884,000	884,000
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE	905,000	905,000
SUTTON LAKE	1,093,000	1,093,000
TYGART RIVER LAKE	855,000	855,000
WISCONSIN		
EAU GALLE RIVER	477,000	477,000
FOX RIVER	930,000	930,000
GREEN BAY HARBOR (DIKED DISPOSAL)	9,030,000	9,030,000
GREEN BAY HARBOR	757,000	757,000
KEWAUNEE HARBOR	848,000	848,000
LAFARGE LAKE	46,000	46,000
MANITOWOC HARBOR	1,505,000	1,505,000
MILWAUKEE HARBOR	4,786,000	4,786,000
RACINE HARBOR	40,000	40,000
SHEBOYGAN HARBOR	307,000	307,000
STURGEON BAY & LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL	1,109,000	1,109,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
MISCELLANEOUS		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	4,170,000	4,170,000
INSPECTION OF NON-FEDERAL LEVEES	1,219,000	1,000,000
SCHEDULING FLOOD CONTROL RESERVOIR OPERATIONS	1,950,000	1,950,000
MONITOR COMPLETED COASTAL PROJECTS	1,200,000	1,000,000
RIVER ICE MANAGEMENT	2,205,000	2,205,000
REPAIR, EVALUATION, MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION RESEARCH (REMR)	7,780,000	7,780,000
PROTECTION OF NAVIGATION		
REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS AND OBSTRUCTIONS	1,000,000	1,000,000
PROTECTION, CLEARING AND STRAIGHTENING CHANNELS (SECTION 3)	50,000	50,000
GENERAL REGULATORY FUNCTIONS	52,937,000	50,000,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS	7,128,000	7,128,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS	2,204,000	2,000,000
COMMERCIAL STATISTICS	3,022,000	2,500,000
MOBILIZATION PLANNING	13,500,000	10,000,000
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-9,621,000	-52,621,000
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,420,000,000	1,369,418,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:

- (N) NAVIGATION
- (FC) FLOOD CONTROL
- (BE) BEACH EROSION CONTROL
- (MP) MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER
- (FDP) FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION
- (SP) SHORELINE PROTECTION
- (SPEC) SPECIAL
- (COMP) COMPREHENSIVE
- (PHASE I) AUTHORIZD FOR PHASE I STAGE OF ADVANCE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN IN THE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974 OR 1976

REVOLVING FUND

Appropriations 1986	$6,699,000
Budget estimate, 1987	12,000,000
House allowance	12,000,000
Committee recommendation	12,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $12,000,000, which is the same as the House allowance and budget request.

The fund provides for the acquisition, operation, and maintenance of plant and equipment used in civil works functions; for temporary financing of services chargeable to civil appropriations; and for furnishing facilities and services for military functions of the Department of the Army, other governmental agencies and private persons (33 U.S.C. 576).

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriations 1986	$102,399,000
Budget estimate, 1987	115,000,000
House allowance	115,000,000
Committee recommendation	115,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $115,000,000, which is the same as the budget request and House allowance.

This appropriation finances the expenses of the Office, Chief of Engineers, the division offices, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers.

GENERAL

Hydroelectric generator procurement.—The Committee understands that some foreign countries have adopted policies which directly or indirectly prohibit U.S. manufacturers of hydroelectric turbine generators from bidding on projects in those countries. The Corps of Engineers, however, would allow manufacturers from foreign countries to bid on U.S. Federal projects. In light of this situation, the Corps is directed to provide at least 90 days notice to the Appropriations Committees of both the House and Senate if any request for proposals or bid solicitation involving acquisition of hydroelectric turbine generating equipment could result in award of the contract to any overseas manufacturer. Such notice shall include the justification for allowing such overseas sourcing of such equipment, however, cost differences alone will not be considered sufficient justification for such practice.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1986	$32,571,000
Budget estimate, 1987	27,820,000
House allowance	32,320,000
Committee recommendation	26,929,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−891,000
House allowance	−5,391,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $26,929,000, which is $891,000 below the budget request, $5,391,000 below the House allowance.

Umatilla Basin Project Investigation.—Up to $75,000 of General Investigation funds may be used to continue Bureau of Reclamation studies of the interrelationship of surface water enhancement and critical ground water levels in the Umatilla River basin in Oregon.

High Plains Cooperative Program.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 to continue research grant work related to cloud seeding and pilot training.

The recommended amounts provided under this heading for surveys and activities are shown in the following table:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Type of project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS				
ARIZONA				
SPRING CANYON PUMPED STORAGE PROJECT	PROJ.INV.-P	270,000	1,200,000	270,000
PIMA COUNTY/SANTA CRUZ RIVER GROUNDWATER	PROJ.INV.-M&I	100,000	100,000	100,000
CALIFORNIA				
ALL AMERICAN CANAL RELOCATION	ADV.PLNG.	630,000	630,000	630,000
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:				
DELTA DIVISION, KELLOGG UNIT REFORMULATION	PROJ.INV.	---	200,000	---
DELTA SUPPORT STUDIES	SP.INV.	283,000	283,000	283,000
DELTA WATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	SP.INV.	---	400,000	400,000
IMPERIAL IRRIGATION DISTRICT CANAL LINING AND SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT	PROJ.INV.-I	72,000	72,000	72,000
OFFSTREAM STORAGE	PROJ.INV.-I	350,000	350,000	350,000
REFUGE WATER SUPPLY	PROJ.INV.	170,000	170,000	170,000
SAN BERNARDINO VALLEY GROUNDWATER	PROJ.INV.-M&I	150,000	150,000	150,000
SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY CONVEYANCE STUDY, CVP	PROJ.INV.	---	500,000	250,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Type of project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
COLORADO				
CRWQIP, LOWER GUNNISON BASIN UNIT	ADV.PLNG.	100,000	100,000	100,000
HIGH MOUNTAIN AQUIFER STUDY	PROJ.INV.-M&I	230,000	230,000	230,000
MESA-DELTA M&I GROUNDWATER STUDY	SP.INV.-M&I	180,000	180,000	180,000
SOUTH PLATTE RIVER OPERATIONS STUDY	SP.INV.	115,000	115,000	115,000
IDAHO				
OAKLEY FAN GROUNDWATER & RECHARGE INVESTIGATION	PROJ.INV.-I	150,000	150,000	150,000
MINIDOKA PROJECT,NORTH SIDE PUMPING DIVISION EXTEN	ADV.PLNG.	160,000	160,000	160,000
KANSAS				
KANSAS RIVER BASIN WATER OPERATIONS STUDY	SP.INV.-M&I	180,000	180,000	180,000
MONTANA				
MILK RIVER WATER SUPPLY UNIT (P-SMBP) (FORMERLY MARIAS-MILK UNIT (P-SMBP)	PROJ.INV.-I	140,000	140,000	140,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Type of project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
NEBRASKA				
LOUP BASIN STUDY	SP.INV.	---	100,000	---
PRAIRIE BEND UNIT (P-SMBP)	PROJ.INV.-I	401,000	701,000	401,000
SOUTH PLATTE-FRENCHMAN PROJECT	PROJ.INV.	---	100,000	---
NEVADA				
DEEP-CARBONATE AQUIFER	PROJ.INV.-I	764,000	764,000	764,000
NEW MEXICO				
ALAMOGORDO M&I WATER SUPPLY STUDY	PROJ.INV.-M&I	150,000	150,000	150,000
SAN MIGUEL ACEQUIAS ON TH PECOS RIVER		---	50,000	---
OKLAHOMA				
EAST CENTRAL OKLAHOMA WATER SUPPLY STUDY	PROJ.INV.	---	500,000	---
KIAMICHI HYDROPOWER STUDY	PROJ.INV.	---	500,000	---
NORTHWEST OKLAHOMA WATER SUPPLY STUDY	PROJ.INV.-M&I	170,000	170,000	170,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Type of project (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
SOUTHEAST OKLAHOMA WATER SUPPLY STUDY.....	PROJ.INV.-M&I	230,000	230,000	230,000
OREGON				
DESCHUTES RIVER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT.....	SP.INV.-I	50,000	50,000	50,000
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT.....	ADV.PLNG.	134,000	134,000	234,000
NO. DOUGLAS CO. COOP. WTR RES STUDY (FORMERLY UMPQUA RIVER BASIN WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT INVEST.).....	SP.INV.	215,000	215,000	215,000
SOUTH DAKOTA				
CENTRAL SOUTH DAKOTA WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM (CENDAK).....	ADV.PLNG.	200,000	750,000	750,000
TEXAS				
TEXAS BASIN, BEDIAS PROJECT.....	PROJ.INV.-M&I	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
TEXAS BASIN, SAN JACINTO PROJECT.....	PROJ.INV.-M&I	120,000	120,000	120,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Type of project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
UTAH				
CRSP POWER PEAKING CAPACITY	PROJ.INV.-P	300,000	300,000	300,000
CRWQIP, DIRTY DEVIL RIVER UNIT	ADV.PLNG.	165,000	165,000	165,000
WASATCH FRONT TOTAL WATER MANAGEMENT	SP.INV.-M&I	90,000	90,000	90,000
WASHINGTON				
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	ADV.PLNG.	100,000	100,000	100,000
WYOMING				
SEMINOE DAM MODIFICATION	SP.INV.	70,000	70,000	70,000
VARIOUS				
UPPER SNAKE RIVER WATER MANAGEMENT	SP.INV.	200,000	200,000	200,000
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	PROJ.INV.-I	3,620,000	3,620,000	3,620,000
GENERAL ENGINEERING AND RESEARCH:				
ATMOSPHERIC WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	GEN.ENG.&RES.	4,800,000	6,400,000	5,300,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1986	$499,267,000
Budget estimate, 1987	576,759,000
House allowance	592,359,000
Committee recommendation	577,059,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+ 300,000
House allowance	− 15,300,000

A new appropriation of $577,059,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is $300,000 over the budget request and $15,300,000 below the House allowance.

The amounts recommended by the Committee are shown on the following table along with the budget request and House allowance:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Type of project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
PROGRAM RELATED ENGINEERING AND SCIENTIFIC STUDIES....	GEN.ENG.&RES.	4,870,000	4,870,000	3,400,000
SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS:				
ENVIRONMENTAL AND INTERAGENCY COORD. ACTIVITIES.....	SP.INV.	4,330,000	4,330,000	4,330,000
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES.....	SP.INV.	400,000	400,000	400,000
INVESTIGATIONS OF EXISTING PROJECTS.....	SP.INV.	555,000	555,000	255,000
MINOR WORK IN CONNECTION WITH COMPLETED PROJ.INVEST.	SP.INV.	620,000	620,000	520,000
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES.....	SP.INV.	1,565,000	1,565,000	1,565,000
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS...		-1,179,000	-2,409,000	-2,000,000
TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS.....		27,820,000	32,320,000	26,929,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM					
CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS					
ARIZONA					
HEADGATE ROCK HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT (BIA).....	51,900,000	8,300,000	6,800,000	6,800,000	6,800,000
CALIFORNIA					
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:					
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION.....	353,206,000	297,454,000	1,060,000	1,060,000	1,060,000
SAN LUIS UNIT.....	1,261,980,000	496,529,000	12,172,000	12,172,000	12,172,000
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT.....	2,093,948,000	339,570,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS.....	609,270,000	606,555,000	372,000	372,000	372,000
TRINITY RIVER RESTORATION PROGRAM.....	306,020,000	244,109,000	4,650,000	4,650,000	4,650,000
SAN FELIPE DIVISION.....	342,410,000	281,282,000	10,642,000	10,642,000	10,642,000
SPRING CREEK TOXICITY PROGRAM, CVP.....	700,000	---	350,000	350,000	350,000
LOWER COLORADO RIVER WATER SUPPLY.....	1,657,000	---	---	100,000	---

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
COLORADO					
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II,CRBSCP.....	243,043,000	48,161,000	12,055,000	12,055,000	12,055,000
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP.....	84,072,000	19,987,000	12,282,000	12,282,000	12,282,000
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CLOSED BASIN DIVISION.....	77,292,000	52,953,000	12,594,000	12,594,000	12,594,000
NEBRASKA					
NORTH LOUP DIVISION, P-SMBP.....	350,910,000	178,795,000	14,035,000	14,035,000	14,035,000
O'NEILL UNIT, P-SMBP.....	173,424,000	7,476,000	1,381,000	1,381,000	1,381,000
NEVADA					
LAS VEGAS WASH UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP.....	129,799,000	7,965,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
NEW MEXICO					
BRANTLEY PROJECT.....	128,640,000	77,216,000	23,650,000	23,650,000	23,650,000
NORTH DAKOTA					
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, P-SMBP.....	1,402,193,000	266,042,000	18,000,000	33,000,000	33,000,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
OKLAHOMA					
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT	105,635,000	90,263,000	7,755,000	7,755,000	7,755,000
SOUTH DAKOTA					
BELLE FOURCHE UNIT, P-SMBP	48,415,000	817,000	3,900,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
WEB RURAL WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECT	85,741,000	44,777,000	21,480,000	21,480,000	21,480,000
WASHINGTON					
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM PROJECT, OROVILLE-TONASKET UNIT	78,000,000	66,589,000	1,725,000	1,725,000	1,725,000
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT:					
IRRIGATION FACILITIES	3,204,576,000	909,755,000	7,110,000	7,110,000	7,110,000
THIRD POWERPLANT	761,250,000	683,245,000	23,890,000	23,890,000	23,890,000
YAKIMA FISH PASSAGE & PROTECTIVE FACILITIES	28,615,000	7,773,000	12,050,000	12,050,000	12,050,000
WYOMING					
BUFFALO BILL DAM MODIFICATION, P-SMBP	66,235,000	7,998,000	13,400,000	13,400,000	13,400,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
VARIOUS					
BOULDER CANYON PROJECT	35,457,000	2,795,000	5,760,000	5,760,000	5,760,000
COLORADO RIVER BRIDGE CROSSING	74,500,000	590,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
MEASURES BELOW IMPERIAL DAM, TITLE I, CRBSCP	464,763,000	290,110,000	26,427,000	26,427,000	26,427,000
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION:					
ARBUCKLE PROJECT, OKLAHOMA	3,560,000	686,000	310,000	310,000	310,000
BOISE PROJECT, ARROWROCK DIVISION, IDAHO	6,870,000	464,000	1,490,000	1,490,000	1,490,000
BOISE PROJECT, PAYETTE DIVISION, IDAHO	31,040,000	27,789,000	1,289,000	1,289,000	1,289,000
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK&LEVEE SYSTEM,AR.,CO.,NV	158,812,000	41,097,000	15,885,000	15,885,000	15,885,000
CULTURAL RESOURCES ACTIVITIES	3,393,000	313,000	507,000	507,000	507,000
FRYINGPAN ARKANSAS PROJECT, COLORADO	494,500,000	480,426,000	5,513,000	5,513,000	5,513,000
GILA PROJECT, ARIZONA-CALIFORNIA	78,115,000	76,637,000	845,000	845,000	845,000
KLAMATH PROJECT, OREGON-CALIFORNIA	51,533,000	40,180,000	1,889,000	1,889,000	1,889,000
LEADVILLE MINE DRAINAGE TUNNEL, COLORADO	7,346,000	3,446,000	375,000	375,000	375,000
MISCELLANEOUS ENGINEERING SERVICES, COLORADO	433,000	423,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT, OKLAHOMA	42,639,000	42,480,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
NEWLANDS PROJECT, NEVADA	26,146,000	4,228,000	1,134,000	1,134,000	1,134,000
NUECES RIVER PROJECT, TEXAS	97,555,000	93,658,000	1,420,000	1,420,000	1,420,000
PALMETTO BEND PROJECT, TEXAS	73,146,000	72,974,000	150,000	150,000	150,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
UNITS OR DIVISIONS, PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM:					
AINSWORTH UNIT, NEBRASKA	25,683,000	25,083,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
CANYON FERRY UNIT, MONTANA	17,607,000	17,008,000	522,000	522,000	522,000
EAST BENCH UNIT, MONTANA	24,230,000	23,295,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
FARWELL UNIT, NEBRASKA	42,829,000	40,458,000	180,000	180,000	180,000
OAHE UNIT, SOUTH DAKOTA	490,000,000	41,989,000	65,000	65,000	65,000
OWL CREEK UNIT, WYOMING	7,010,000	6,732,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
VELARDE COMMUNITY DITCH PROJECT, NEW MEXICO	17,526,000	6,580,000	2,280,000	2,280,000	2,280,000
WASHOE PROJECT, CALIFORNIA-NEVADA	356,455,000	41,338,000	205,000	205,000	205,000
WEBER BASIN PROJECT, UTAH	98,053,000	96,015,000	385,000	385,000	385,000
SUBTOTAL, DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION			35,259,000	35,259,000	35,259,000
SAFETY OF DAMS PROGRAMS:					
COOLIDGE DAM, ARIZONA	---	---	---	500,000	300,000
CACHUMA PROJECT, BRADBURY DAM, CALIFORNIA	5,000,000	---	90,000	90,000	90,000
FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT, COLORADO	2,031,000	1,576,000	207,000	207,000	207,000
HEART BUTTE UNIT, HEART BUTTE DAM,N.DAKOTA(P-SMBP)	4,500,000	1,102,000	2,540,000	2,540,000	2,540,000
LEWISTON ORCHARDS, SOLDIERS MEADOW, IDAHO	935,000	574,000	335,000	335,000	335,000
MINIDOKA PROJECT, JACKSON LAKE DAM, IDAHO-WYOMING	82,000,000	9,942,000	14,770,000	14,770,000	14,770,000
NEWLANDS PROJECT, LAKE TAHOE DAM, CALIFORNIA-NEVADA	610,000	---	180,000	180,000	180,000
NEWTON PROJECT, NEWTON DAM, UTAH	3,043,000	200,000	2,543,000	2,543,000	2,543,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
RAPID VALLEY UNIT,PACTOLA DAM,SOUTH DAKOTA(P-SMBP)..	9,405,000	7,044,000	1,463,000	1,463,000	1,463,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, STEWART MTN. DAM, ARIZONA.....	44,201,000	2,748,000	2,291,000	2,291,000	2,291,000
SAN LUIS UNIT, LITTLE PANOCHE DAM, CALIFORNIA (CVP).	383,000	---	40,000	40,000	40,000
SAN LUIS UNIT, LOS BANOS DAM, CALIFORNIA (CVP).....	360,000	---	40,000	40,000	40,000
SAN LUIS UNIT, O'NEILL DAM, CALIFORNIA (CVP).....	1,350,000	---	60,000	60,000	60,000
SEEDSKADEE, FONTENELLE DAM, CRSP, WYOMING.....	52,000,000	287,000	6,100,000	6,100,000	6,100,000
VENTURA RIVER PROJECT, CASITAS DAM, CALIFORNIA.....	3,000,000	---	90,000	90,000	90,000
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT, ALTUS DAM, OKLAHOMA.....	2,700,000	483,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.....	4,625,000	2,355,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
MODIFICATION REPORTS AND PRECONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY...	56,916,000	21,458,000	5,859,000	5,859,000	5,859,000
SUBTOTAL, SAFETY OF DAMS PROGRAMS.....			38,458,000	38,958,000	38,758,000
REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT:					
OKANOGAN PROJECT, OKANOGAN IRRIGATION DISTRICT, WA..	9,936,000	8,877,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
SHOSHONE PROJECT, HEART MOUNTAIN DIVISION, WYOMING..	5,500,000	4,292,000	750,000	750,000	750,000
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT, UTAH.....	7,651,000	5,687,000	853,000	853,000	853,000
SUN RIVER PROJECT, FT. SHAW DIVISION, MONTANA.....	1,400,000	278,000	380,000	380,000	380,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT, COLORADO.....	5,640,000	3,791,000	664,000	664,000	664,000
SUBTOTAL, REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT.....			3,647,000	3,647,000	3,647,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS			332,479,000	348,079,000	347,779,000
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT					
UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND					
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS					
COLORADO					
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT.....	314,608,000	4,218,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
DALLAS CREEK PROJECT.....	116,527,000	102,578,000	4,286,000	4,286,000	4,286,000
DOLORES PROJECT.....	404,524,000	250,504,000	20,375,000	20,375,000	20,375,000

Garrison Diversion Unit, ND.—The Committee has included $33,000,000, the same as the House allowance and $15,000,000 over the budget request, to carry out construction activities of the reformulated Garrison Diversion Unit in North Dakota.

It should be pointed out that, after extended debate and review, legislation reformulating the project was signed into law on May 12, 1986, thus ending the longstanding uncertainty and controversy surrounding the project.

While the budget included $18,000,000 to close down the project because the reformulation legislation has not been enacted, the Committee action diverts those funds, in addition to the $15,000,000, to ongoing project activities under the reformulated act.

Theodore Roosevelt and Stewart Mountain Dams, AZ (Safety of Dams).—Last year, the Congress directed the Secretary of the Interior to proceed as expeditiously as possible to correct safety deficiencies at Roosevelt and Stewart Mountain Dams on the Salt River in Arizona. In order that work may move as quickly as possible, the Committee urges the Bureau of Reclamation to make an additional $3,100,000 available, if needed, from CAP project funds for safety work on the Salt River dams.

San Luis Unit, Central Valley Project, CA.—The Committee recognizes the urgency of developing an economical, environmentally sound, and publicly acceptable plan for resolving the irrigation drainage problem in the San Joaquin Valley of the San Luis Unit, Central Valley Project, CA. The Committee realizes the Bureau of Reclamation was ordered by the California State Water Resources Board to close and cleanup Kesterson Reservoir by February 1988. The Committee recommendation includes the full amount requested, $12,172,000, to complete the Kesterson Reservoir closure and cleanup studies in a timely manner and to cleanup Kesterson Reservoir. The Committee further understands the final cleanup plan has not been determined and appropriations to cover the cost of implementing such a plan will need to be addressed in the future.

The Committee should point out, however, that in order to use any funds appropriated for the San Luis Unit, the appropriations ceiling for the project must be increased. Therefore, the Committee has included a provision in the act which would authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to use the $12,172,000 recommended.

It should be pointed out, however, that legislative authorization will be needed in fiscal 1988 before any further funds can be expended on this project.

Coolidge Dam, AZ (Safety of Dams).—Long-term safety modifications are needed at Coolidge Dam in Arizona. While realizing that the dam is the responsibility of the Bureau of Indian Affairs [BIA], the Committee also understands that the Bureau of Reclamation is responsible for coordinating all dam safety issues in the Department of the Interior and that the Bureau has been assisting the BIA by collecting data and performing preliminary design work to determine the nature and extent of

actions needed to correct the problems at Coolidge Dam. Therefore, the Committee is providing $300,000 to allow the Bureau to continue these activities.

North Loup Division, NE.—The Committee has amended a provision included in the House-passed bill which increases the appropriations ceiling on the North Loup project in Nebraska from $79,500,000 to $333,865,000. The project is more than 50 percent complete and the additional ceiling is needed in order for construction to continue in an orderly manner.

Central Arizona Project.—The Committee is aware of the recent cost-sharing agreement on plan 6 entered into by Arizona interests and the Secretary of the Department of the Interior and believes this agreement is an indication of local commitment to timely completion of the project. It is the Committee's hope that the project can be completed in a timely manner given the commitment on the part of the non-Federal interests.

The Committee also acknowledges the Secretary's commitment to proceed expeditiously with safety modifications for U.S. Bureau of Reclamation dams on the Salt River and understands that preconstruction activities, pursuant to the Federal Reclamation Safety of Dams Act, Public Law 98–404, are nearing completion. The Committee directs the Secretary to continue to proceed in an expeditious manner with the safety modifications. The Committee further directs that the Secretary of the Interior give priority in reprogramming funds to bring the funding levels for dam safety up to the Bureau of Reclamation's full capability in 1987.

New Mexico Acequias Rehabilitation.—For several years the Congress has supported renovation work at Velarde, NM. This bill continues that support with an appropriation of $2,280,000, as requested by the President.

While this bill adds no additional funds for the unauthorized acequia work, such activity is likely to be consolidated and refocused as part of H.R. 6, the omnibus Corps of Engineers authorization legislation now in conference. It is the intention of the Committee to consider this acequia program once authorized.

Since future activities will be dependent upon non-Federal interests agreeing to an acceptable level of cost sharing, the State of New Mexico and other interested parties are urged to take early steps to identify those sources of non-Federal funding necessary to begin the acequias rehabilitation work and to identify those acequias that would be considered for rehabilitation.

Central Utah Project.—The Committee has included language in the act which provides that not more than 20 percent of total annual appropriations for the Central Utah Project may be expended by the Secretary of the Interior for all administrative expenses and requires that the inspector general of the Department of the Interior annually audit expenditures by the Bureau of Reclamation to determine compliance with this limitation.

The intent of this section is to limit annual administrative costs as a proportion of total project appropriations. Administrative costs are all costs which are not directly identified to the construction of specific project facilities. These costs are incurred centrally and charged to the project on the basis of the utilization of Bureau labor services. This limitation shall not apply to costs directly identified to the construction of project facilities such as right-of-way appraisals, land acquisition, designs, and payments to contractors.

The Committee is aware of reductions in the amount of annual appropriations that have been allocated for project construction purposes. The objective of the Committee is to maximize to the greatest extent possible that precentage of each annual appropriation which is expended on project construction, particularly for those project features which are designed to provide water deliveries to the Wasatch Front such as the Jordanelle Reservoir. The Committee intends that all funds appropriated for the Bonneville Unit shall be expended by the Bureau for project purposes. The Bureau of Reclamation should limit, to the maximum extent possible, the impact of underfinancing on the Bonneville unit. Further, the Bureau of Reclamation is directed to keep congressional interests and the local project sponsor informed as to changes in underfinancing. The Committee realizes that it may be necessary for the Bureau to contract out for engineering and design services in order to meet the limitation imposed by this amendment and encourages the Bureau to do so.

The Committee has also included a provision which eliminates a possible 10-year interest-free repayment deferral period for the portion of the Bonneville Unit of the Central Utah Project for which the Water Supply Act of 1958 was invoked in 1981. The Bureau of Reclamation and the project sponsor, Central Utah Water Conservancy District, in 1981 invoked section 301(b) of the Water Supply Act of 1958 which altered several repayment terms for water delivery of 60,000 acre-feet to be developed by certain features of the Strawberry Collection System. The purpose of this section is to nullify application of the 10-year interest-free period provided by section 301(b)(2) which may have been utilized to defer repayment on those portions of the Strawberry Collection System which were the subject in 1981 of the Water Supply Act invocation. It is the Committee's intent that repayment of these Strawberry Collection System features should commence in accordance with the terms provided for repayment by the several repayment agreements entered into between project sponsors and the Bureau of Reclamation which require repayment of principal and interest to commence upon the issuance of block notices by the Bureau. The Committee is aware that the first block notice for delivery of water from the lower portion of the Strawberry Collection System has been duly issued and that water exchange agreements have been executed to initiate repayment of principal and interest for those features subject to that block notice consistent with this section.

This section also provides that in the event that the Bonneville Unit is not substantially complete, as determined by the Secretary, at the end of fiscal year 1995, the Central Utah Water Conservancy District will have credited to its reimbursement obligation the sum of $2,000,000 each year thereafter for a period not to exceed 5 years.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1986	$126,960,000
Budget estimate, 1987	150,000,000
House allowance	140,000,000
Committee recommendation	150,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	+10,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $150,000,000, which is the same as the budget request.

The fiscal year 1987 budget provides for operation and maintenance and associated work on 34 projects. The program also provides for the negotiation and administration of water marketing contracts; soil and moisture conservation; flood control operations at a number of water user operated reservoirs; water management and construction; and examination of existing structures, et cetera.

LOAN PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1986	$37,624,000
Budget estimate, 1987	38,021,000
House allowance	40,651,000
Committee recommendation	37,480,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−541,000
House allowance	−3,171,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $37,480,000. This is $3,171,000 below the House allowance and $541,000 below the budget request.

This appropriation provides for loans to non-Federal organizations for construction and rehabilitation of distribution systems and for loans and grants to construct small irrigation projects.

The Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 was enacted for the purpose of encouraging local participation by qualified organizations in the development of small reclamation projects and to provide Federal assistance in the development of similar projects by non-Federal organizations.

The Committee again wishes to point out that the loan program has reached the point that the initiation of any new loans will cause the appropriations ceiling of $600,000,000 to be exceeded. Therefore, if any additional projects are to be undertaken in the future, legislation to raise the appropriations ceiling must be enacted.

Amity Mutual Irrigation Co.—Therefore, the Committee has deleted the $2,541,000 requested for the Amity Mutual Irrigation Co. loan because of the irrigation company's decision not to accept Federal loan funds.

Funds provided under this heading are distributed as shown in the following table:

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
UTAH					
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, BONNEVILLE UNIT	1,589,240,000	604,588,000	83,793,000	83,793,000	83,793,000
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, UINTAH UNIT	155,284,000	5,977,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, UPALCO UNIT	123,504,000	14,770,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
VARIOUS					
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION:					
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS:					
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, JENSEN UNIT	76,213,000	60,089,000	303,000	303,000	303,000
UNITS:					
MODIFICATIONS & ADDITIONS TO COMPLETED FACILITIES	24,063,000	13,358,000	1,022,000	1,022,000	1,022,000
RECREATIONAL AND FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES:					
RECREATIONAL FACILITIES	177,242,000	102,187,000	8,747,000	8,747,000	8,747,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES	182,764,000	51,090,000	4,018,000	4,018,000	4,018,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT			123,694,000	123,694,000	123,694,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT					
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT					
ARIZONA					
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, NON-INDIAN DISTR. SYSTEMS....	274,468,000	70,750,000	57,174,000	57,174,000	57,174,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA-WATER DEVELOPMENT (LCRBDF).....	3,170,732,000	1,547,508,000	145,596,000	145,596,000	145,596,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA - SAFETY OF DAMS.....	226,000,000	3,828,000	1,147,000	1,147,000	1,147,000
VARIOUS					
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS...	---	---	-83,331,000	-83,331,000	-98,331,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM.....			576,759,000	592,359,000	577,059,000

LOAN PROGRAM

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
LOAN PROGRAM					
ARIZONA					
AK-CHIN FARMS EAST (ESCALATION)	14,241,000	12,241,000	---	2,000,000	2,000,000
AK-CHIN FARMS PROJECT-PHASE 2	13,588,000	4,414,000	5,188,000	5,188,000	5,188,000
GILA RIVER FARMS SUPPLEMENTAL	6,683,000	478,000	1,537,000	1,537,000	1,537,000
CALIFORNIA					
EASTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT	25,390,000	19,234,000	1,070,000	1,700,000	1,070,000
ELSINORE VALLEY IRRIGATION DISTRICT	25,975,000	478,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
OAKDALE IRRIGATION DISTRICT	17,774,000	13,421,000	4,100,000	4,100,000	4,100,000
RAINBOW MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT (ESCALATION)	18,591,000	15,956,000	3,400,000	3,400,000	3,400,000
RANCHO CALIFORNIA WATER DISTRICT	20,286,000	96,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
SAN BENITO COUNTY WATER CONS. & FLOOD DISTRICT	19,716,000	19,351,000	365,000	365,000	365,000
SANTA ANA WATERSHED PROJECT AUTHORITY	14,714,000	3,828,000	8,714,000	8,714,000	8,714,000
COLORADO					
AMITY MUTUAL IRRIGATION COMPANY	4,223,000	1,610,000	2,541,000	2,541,000	---

LOAN PROGRAM—C

[Amounts in dolla

Project title	Total Federal cost
(1)	(2)
MONTANA	
EAST BENCH GRAVITY COMPANY.....	3,193,000
TEXAS	
HIDALGO COUNTY IRRIGATION DISTRICT NO.1, SUPPL.....	12,972,000
HIDALGO COUNTY IRRIGATION DISTICT NO.2 (SAN JUAN).....	16,100,000
DELTA LAKE IRRIGATION DISTRICT.....	10,982,000
WASHINGTON	
GREATER WENATCHEE IRRIGATION DISTRICT.....	6,562,000
VARIOUS	
CONSTRUCTION COST INCREASES.....	11,322,000
ADMINISTRATION OF LOAN PROGRAM.....	13,339,000
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS...	---
TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM.....	

ntinued

Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
1,931,000	1,175,000	1,175,000	1,175,000
---	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
12,338,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
9,457,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
1,436,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
5,861,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
9,135,000	840,000	840,000	840,000
---	-2,809,000	-2,809,000	-2,809,000
	38,021,000	40,651,000	37,480,000

LOAN PROGRAM

(LIMITATION ON DIRECT LOANS)

Appropriations, 1986	($46,237,000)
Budget estimate, 1987	(43,806,000)
House allowance	(42,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(43,806,000)
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	(+1,806,000)

The Committee recommends a loan limitation of $43,806,000, which is the same as the budget request.

The limitation provides a control over the principal amount of loans that may be made under the Loan Program in fiscal year 1987.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1986	$47,084,000
Budget estimate, 1987	51,200,000
House allowance	51,200,000
Committee recommendation	51,200,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $51,200,000, which is the same as the budget request and House allowance.

This appropriation finances the general administrative and technical direction of the Reclamation Program as performed by the Department, Denver regional and other offices in the seven regions.

EMERGENCY FUND

Appropriations, 1986	$957,000
Budget estimate, 1987	1,000,000
House allowance	1,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,000,000, which is the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

This fund is used to assure continuous operation of all projects and project facilities governed by the Federal reclamation law in the event of drought, canal bank failures, electrical system failures, municipal and industrial water delivery system failures, or other emergencies. Because of excessively high emergency requirements resulting from contamination problems at Kesterson Reservoir in fiscal year 1985, it is expected that all prior year emergency funds will be committed.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

Appropriations, 1986	
Budget estimate, 1987	$6,400,000
House allowance	6,400,000
Committee recommendation	6,400,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

An appropriation of $6,400,000, which is the same as the budget request and House allowance, is recommended for the Working Capital Fund.

The Working Capital Fund [WCF] was established in December 1985 pursuant to authorizing language included in the Fiscal Year 1986 Appropriation Act. Ongoing activities in support of all Bureau programs and projects and for other agencies will be brought under the WCF. The fund will provide a more efficient and equitable means of financing services, supplies, and equipment provided to beneficiaries. Initial WCF activities include centralized computer services, the Bureau's core sampling and drilling program, and development and maintenance of construction/engineering training modules.

The WCF is intended to operate within its own resources through charges to beneficiaries for reimbursement of direct costs. The fund will also enable the Bureau to accumulate funds for replacement of assets from charges for depreciation. In the early years, acquisition of new assets or replacement of obsolete ones may require appropriations because depreciation charges were not accumulated on existing assets in the past. In fiscal year 1987, $6,400,000 is required to continue acquisition of a computer-aided design and drafting system [CADDS] to be used bureauwide, bringing state-of-the-art technology to the engineering and design functions.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Funds recommended in the bill provide for Department of Energy programs relating to energy supply, research, and development activities; uranium supply and enrichment activities; general science and research activities; atomic energy defense activities; departmental administration; power marketing activities; the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; and the Geothermal Resources Development Fund.

Energy Supply, Research, and Development Activities

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1986	$1,479,043,000
Budget estimate, 1987	1,062,807,000
House allowance	1,064,696,000
Committee recommendation	1,084,438,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+21,631,000
House allowance	+19,742,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1986	$217,255,000
Budget estimate, 1987	191,355,000
House allowance	251,630,000
Committee recommendation	234,360,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+43,005,000
House allowance	−17,270,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,318,798,000 for energy supply, research, and development activities. The purpose of these funds is to support the development of new energy technologies and improve the efficiency of existing technologies. Included are the development and demonstration of solar energy, wind, ocean systems, biomass, geothermal, nuclear fission and fusion, electric energy systems, and energy storage. Efforts associated with basic energy sciences and environmental research are also included.

BUDGET JUSTIFICATION MATERIAL

The Department of Energy prepares and submits to the Committees on Appropriation of the House and Senate, justification material intended to describe and explain the program performance, accomplishments, objectives, and requirements for funding of the various programs, projects, and activities of the Department. This material is sub-

63-659 O - 86 - 4

mitted for the use of the Committees primarily, but serves also to identify and explain the Department's activities to the Congress and the general public.

During the past 5 years, most programs in the Energy Department have been reduced in real dollars. However, the amount of material used to explain or justify these programs and their funding requirements has increased. At the same time, the material presented has become more obtuse and general for the purpose of justifying the budget requirements.

The Department is to prepare for the use of the Appropriation Committees streamlined, shortened, and improved justification material. The Committee directs the Department's budget office to work closely with the Committee staff during the coming months to design improved justification formats.

SOLAR ENERGY

The administration proposes major reductions from the fiscal year 1986 level of funding for solar and renewable energy activities. The budget request would accelerate the downward trend in these programs which have been substantially curtailed over the last 5 years. As in the past, the technology development would be focused on long-term research and development.

The Committee agrees that the marketplace must ultimately decide the future role of the solar technologies. Most solar and renewables research, however, has not been developed to the point where the private sector alone can be expected to carry forward with its development.

The Committee considers it essential that a viable solar and renewable energy research and development program be maintained in the Department of Energy and that the staff expertise be maintained to properly manage this type of effort. Continued basic research and development of solar and renewable energy is essential to maintain a balanced energy research program.

Accordingly, the Committee recommends continuation of program funds and staffing levels to carry out this basic research activity. The Committee recommendation for solar energy is $125,792,000, which is $18,832,000 below funding from this year and $53,500,000 above the level of the budget request.

Solar building systems.—The Committee recommends $7,200,000 for solar building energy research, $500,000 below the level of operating expenses in the current year and $2,500,000 over the House allowance. The budget request for this program combines basic and applied research activities formerly carried out in the Active and Passive Solar Program.

The recommendation includes an additional $1,200,000 to continue open-cycle cooling materials and components research.

Photovoltaic energy systems.—The recommendation includes $40,600,000 for photovoltaic energy systems, which is $5,000,000 above the House allowance. This recommended funding will continue the highest

priority requirements needed to continue progress in reducing costs and improving efficiencies of photovoltaic systems.

The Committee includes up to $6,000,000 for the cost-shared utility scale applications [PVUSA] project.

As in the past years, the Committee expects the Department to maintain a balanced program of advanced research, materials research, technology development, and systems development. The increased funding will also provide for the continued operation of the residential experiment stations.

Solar thermal energy systems.—The Committee recommends $20,000,000 for solar thermal energy, $4,700,000 over the budget request and $5,885,000 below the fiscal year 1986 level.

Biofuels energy systems.—The Committee recommends $27,000,000 for the biofuels program in fiscal year 1987, which is the same as the budget request and the House allowance. The recommendation adopts the structure proposed which combines activities in the areas of biomass, alcohol fuels, and urban waste into one budget category.

The Committee supports the Department's decision to consolidate urban waste research and development program activities within the biofuels program. However, in order to maintain urban waste program viability, the Committee specifically includes a minimum of $5,000,000 for municipal waste R&D activities within the biofuels program.

The Committee provides $4,000,000, the same as last year, to continue the regional biomass energy programs, similar to the successful effort at the Bonneville Power Administration. In addition to providing support for activities at BPA and TVA, the Department shall carry out programs in other regions of the country, particularly in the Midwest and Southwest regions. These regional programs include activities related to technology transfer, industry support, resource assessment, and matching local resources to conversion technologies.

The Committee includes $450,000 for continuation of the entrained oil pyrolysis project.

Wind energy systems.—The recommendation provides $16,750,000 for wind energy systems, an increase of $8,500,000 over the budget request and the same as the House allowance. The wind program should continue to focus research, test, and evaluation on small, intermediate, and large wind systems. The Committee directs the Department to use the House allocations for this program as a general guide for funding the highest priority projects. An amount of $4,500,000 is allocated for completion of the MOD–5B project.

Ocean energy systems.—The Committee provides $4,500,000 for ocean energy systems, the same as the House allowance and $2,000,000 over the budget request. Of the amount provided, $2,000,000 is to be expended to continue work on the PICHTR–OTEC project.

Other solar programs.—The recommendation includes $9,242,000 for other solar activities, $597,000 more than the House allowance. This amount includes funds for program direction and support, technology transfer activities, and the International Solar Energy Program.

The Committee provides a $350,000 matching grant for continuing efforts of a consortium to deploy a low-orbit satellite as a way to transfer energy, argiculture, and health information to developing counties. The PACSAT satellite and ground stations would provide an effective, low-cost system for potential users.

In fiscal year 1985, the Committee made funds available to conduct a technology assessment which evaluates the potential of producing hydrogen as a renewable fuel and identifies the research needed to accomplish this objective. The Committee has provided $1,200,000 to allow the Hawaii Natural Energy Institute and the Florida Solar Energy Center to conduct research on the hydrogen technologies identified in the final report of the technology assessment. Priority is to be given to hydrogen production from renewable energy, photo conversion, and international research on hydrogen utilization.

GEOTHERMAL

The Geothermal Research and Development Program is aimed at resolving technical problems that preclude the private sector from fully developing our vast geothermal resources. The Committee recommends $20,930,000 for geothermal activities, an increase of $3,000,000 over the budget request and $3,000,000 over the House allowance.

Hydrothermal industrialization.—The Committee includes $2,000,000 to continue a minimal effort in the hydrothermal area. These funds will assist States with significant hydrothermal resources to continue programs relating to resource assessment, resource development, technical assistance, and related activities.

Geopressured resources.—The recommendation includes $4,000,000 for geopressured resources, $1,000,000 over the House and the budget request. This funding will continue analysis of long-duration flow test data from the design wells.

Geothermal technology.—The Committee recommends $14,150,000 for geothermal technology activities, the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

The recommendation includes an additional $3,000,000 for hot dry rock research. This additional amount will provide sufficient funds to bring this cost-shared program to successful completion.

Funding was approved in fiscal year 1986 for a demonstration of the hot dry rock technology. The Committee strongly supports the Nutrioso, AZ, proposal during its technical and financial review.

HYDROPOWER

The Committee recommendation includes $450,000 for small-scale hydropower, approximately the same amount allowed in fiscal years 1985–86.

ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE

The Committee recommends $28,019,000 for energy storage and electric energy systems, the same as the House and $11,800,000 over the request.

Electric energy systems.—A total of $11,319,000 is provided for electric energy systems, which is $3,700,000 over the budget request and the same as the House allowance.

The recommendation includes $3,700,000 to continue the Hawaii Deep Water Cable Program.

Energy storage systems.—An amount of $16,700,000 is included for energy storage, an increase of $8,100,000 over the budget request.

An amount of $1,700,000 is provided for completion of a 3-year contract for development activities on the zinc-bromine battery and $1,005,000 is provided for continuation at the current level of research on the aluminum-air battery.

The Committee directs the Department to pursue sodium sulfur battery research in fiscal year 1987 with a qualified domestic firm. Accordingly, the Committee includes an additional $1,000,000 for this effort.

NUCLEAR FISSION

The Committee believes that nuclear fission remains an important option for meeting our electric energy requirements and maintaining a balanced national energy policy. The Committee continues to strongly support the Nuclear Fission Program.

A total of $616,250,000 is provided for the Nuclear Fission Program, $2,050,000 below the House and $15,250,000 below the budget request.

Light water reactors.—An amount of $33,000,000 is recommended for improved LWR technology, which is $5,000,000 below the House allowance.

For advanced light water technology, the recommendation includes $8,000,000, an increase of $6,500,000 over the amount that is available in the current year. The increase will continue the cooperative DOE-industry program which is coordinated with the similar EPRI program on advanced LWR technology development.

For Three Mile Island activities, a total of $12,000,000 is provided, the same as the budget request. The Committee notes that the TMI Program is limited to necessary research and development only. Responsibility for the cost of TMI cleanup remains with the owner of the facility.

Advanced reactor research and development.—The Committee recommends $85,500,000 for advanced reactor R&D, an increase of $21,000,000 over the House allowance and $36,000,000 over the budget request.

In view of the impacts and pressures caused by budget reductions and the importance of the Nation's long-term energy security, the Committee believes it is necessary for the Department of Energy to develop a stronger focus in its LMR and breeder program. A major element of this focus can be provided by the advanced and innovative reactor concepts that have been brought to the attention of the Committee. The

recommended appropriation includes $15,000,000 to continue innovative and advanced reactor research efforts. International collaboration on the LMR must be an essential thrust in the Department's long-range program, both to leverage U.S. resources and to obtain overseas plant operating experience. This collaboration is best achieved on an industry-to-industry basis on systems and plant design and specifically related development programs; therefore, the Committee recommends at least $3,000,000 from within the fiscal year 1987 program funding be allocated to U.S. efforts for such international collaborative programs with the objective of achieving competitive economics for the LMR.

For high-temperature gas reactor technology, the recommendation includes an additional $20,000,000 for continued development of the high-temperature gas reactor [HTGR], including $1,000,000 for capital equipment. The Committee recognizes that stable government support is crucial to the continued progress of the modular gas reactor and the utilities demonstration project initiative. Accordingly, the Committee provides $25,300,000 for continued modular gas reactor activities. The program should remain focused on the referenced plant design and license development and supporting technical development. The primary goal of the program should be to complete conceptual design of the referenced plant, to obtain a licensability statement from NRC and to establish a long-term demonstration project plan.

The recommendation includes an additional $10,000,000 for activities related to the integral fast reactor concept. The Committee agrees with the House provision for an additional $6,000,000 for highest priority nuclear fuel cycle remote technology activities.

Space and defense power systems.—The Committee recommends $37,650,000 for space and defense power systems, an increase of $17,435,000 over the current year and $34,000,000 below the budget request. The recommendation includes funds for the SP–100 program, the isotope power systems, and the multimegawatt power systems. An amount of $6,700,000 is included for the Department of Energy portion of the multimegawatt systems activities, an increase of $4,900,000 over the fiscal year 1986 level of funding.

Advanced nuclear systems.—The Committee recommends $20,600,000, the same level as the House allowance and $1,100,000 over the fiscal year 1986 funding level.

Facilities.—The recommendation includes $127,800,000 for facilities operation and activities, the same as the House and $6,000,000 over the budget request level. The additional funds are intended to increase and maintain at close to current levels the operations at HEDL and ANL-West.

The Committee notes that the Department will propose for key facilities a cost-sharing approach which will distribute costs among the private and public users of the facilities. This approach should reduce the need for appropriated funding in this account while providing for optimum facility utilization. The Committee believes that the Department of Defense, in particular, should reimburse the Department of Energy

for facility use as well as experimental capability. Therefore, the Department is directed to complete, as soon as possible, cost sharing arrangements for fiscal year 1987 and beyond. It is estimated that at least $20,000,000 of the total facilities expenses will be offset by Defense Department utilization in 1987. The Committee also expects the budget request for fiscal year 1988 to include an appropriate level of cost sharing for these facilities.

The House allows funding for a plan to design and construct a cogeneration facility at the FFTF under a number of specific conditions. The Committee supports these conditions, except that non-DOE participants may contribute in services their portion of the total study cost. The Committee, however, remains concerned about the economic viability of the project. Since adequate revenues from the cogeneration facility depend on the continued operation of FFTF, the Committee expects the Department to give clear assurances that it intends to operate the facility at high levels for at least 10 years before any funds are obligated for further design activities.

Remedial actions.—The recommendation of the Committee provides $281,900,000 for the Remedial Action Program, an increase of $1,000,000 more than the House allowance and $12,200,000 below the budget request.

For the Uranium Mill Tailings Program, the Committee provides $124,000,000, an increase of $32,641,000 over fiscal year 1986. This amount of funding will allow the Department to remain on schedule for all sites and vicinity properties, particularly those with completed remedial action plans.

In fiscal year 1986, funding was provided to initiate a civilian byproducts utilization program with emphasis on food irradiation applications. This program is proceeding with plans to support commodity irradiation facilities in the States of Alaska, Oklahoma, Hawaii, Iowa, Florida, Washington, and California. Solicitation of cooperative agreements was delayed and agreements will not be completed until September 1986. Due to the difficulty in completing agreements, unobligated fiscal year 1986 funds of $2,600,000 will be available for requirements in fiscal year 1987. The recommendation includes an additional $2,000,000 for a total of $4,600,000 to continue this program.

Funding is available for continuation of the Department's research and development of tritium radioluminescent lighting systems for utilization on remote airstrips.

Civilian waste.—The Committee includes $6,500,000 for civilian waste research and development which is not funded through the Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund. This amount for nuclear waste research is the same as the budget request and the House allowance. It should be noted that the development and operation of a commercial high-level waste repository and activities associated with the monitored retrievable storage facility are funded at a level of $499,037,000 in fiscal year 1986 from the Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund account.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY, AND HEALTH

The Committee recommends $66,098,000 for environment, safety, and health activities, an increase of $19,177,000 over the current year level of funding and $8,163,000 over the House allowance. The Committee supports the new initiative to strengthen and consolidate the environment, safety, and health function within the Department. The recommended increase includes more than a tripling from current levels for the Environmental Audit and Compliance Program which includes a baseline environmental survey of all operating facilities, including sampling and analysis, and evaluations of corrective measures to be taken at the facilities.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The Committee recommends $194,065,000 for biological and environmental research, $14,115,000 over the current rate and $3,000,000 over the House allowance.

For nuclear medicine programs, the recommendation provides $22,120,000 in operating expenses, the same as the budget request, because of the effectiveness that these programs have demonstrated.

The Committee believes that initial studies on the boron neutron capture therapy for brain tumors has shown great promise. Therefore, the Committee strongly supports continuation of preliminary studies and investigations into this research that would lead to demonstration treatment of human patients.

Project 87–R–130, the Institute of Nuclear Medicine, the Committee includes $3,000,000 for planning, design, and related activities for this facility at the Center for Molecular Medicine and Immunology of the University of Medicine and Dentistry in Newark, NJ.

MAGNETIC FUSION

The recommendation would provide $333,000,000 for the Magnetic Fusion Energy Research Program. This amount is the same as the budget request and $25,000,000 less than the House allowance.

Impressive progress has been made in establishing the scientific feasibility of magnetic fusion energy. Because of uncertainties in the long-term energy supply, it is important to maintain steady progress toward the realization of fusion energy. The Committee has, therefore, long been supportive of the fusion program and believes it is important for the Government to support the program through the present research phase until a definitive engineering and economic assessment can be performed.

Furthermore, fusion research has resulted in significant advances in other areas of technology and scientific research such as: superconducting magnets; numerical analysis techniques; high heat flux and radiation resistance materials; instrumentation and diagnostic development and high power RF systems. It has also made outstanding contributions to the education of a generation of scientists and engineers

with theoretical and experimental skills that are invaluable to the Nation for fusion and other high technology research.

The Committee feels more emphasis should be placed on meeting international commitments. Therefore, the Department shall restore operating support for the Doublet III–D device to 1986 levels, to meet commitments to the Japanese in the areas of neutral beam, ECH, and ICRF heating experiments, and to support the DIII–D tests of advanced tokamak concepts. Restored funding of DIII–D will have the additional benefit of providing necessary information relevant to the design of future proposed devices.

The Committee recommends that funding for the Phaedrus experiment at the University of Wisconsin/Madison be maintained at the current level.

The Committee supports the funding level for advanced fusion concepts [AFC] at Los Alamos National Laboratory at the fiscal year 1986 level, exclusive of the Confinement Physics Research Facility [CPRF], and the CPRF budget should remain as it is in the fiscal year 1987 President's budget.

Finally, the Committee notes the administration's efforts to develop international cooperation for a test reactor project as an augmentation to a strong national program. Without international cooperation such a project may be too costly for any one nation to pursue.

SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

The budget request proposes $523,985,000 for supporting research and technical analysis including basic energy sciences. The Committee provides $576,190,000 for these activities, an increase of $52,205,000 over the budget request and $6,488,000 below the House.

Basic energy sciences.—A total of $495,470,000 is recommended for these activities, an increase of $54,100,000 above the budget request and $8,238,000 below the House.

For nuclear sciences, the Committee recommends $49,993,000, which is the same as the budget request and the House allowance. This is $4,840,000 more than the fiscal year 1986 funding level.

The Committee includes $12,510,000 for operating expenses at the Stanford Synchrotron Radiation Laboratory, most of which is funded through the Nuclear Science Program. This important facility is heavily used by scientists from university, industry, and government laboratories.

For material sciences, the Committee recommends $228,591,000, an increase of $32,200,000 over the budget request and $14,700,000 over the House allowance.

Project 87–R–403, neutron scattering experimental halls, Los Alamos, the Committee recommends $5,000,000 to continue funding for this project to add experimental halls to the Neutron Scattering Center. The Committee includes an additional $1,500,000 in operating expenses for this facility. Funding in fiscal year 1986 was included in the "Atomic energy defense activities" account.

Project 86–R–300, the Center for Science and Technology, Atlanta University, the Committee recommends $5,500,000 to continue and complete Federal assistance for this research center. In fiscal year 1985, the Department provided a grant for design of this facility. Current year funding includes an additional $4,330,000. The Committee recommends funds to proceed with the facility and to assist in strengthening the participation of historically black colleges and universities in scientific research and manpower development pursuant to Executive Order 12320. It is the Committee's understanding that substantial non-Federal contributions will be committed to the project and that no continuing operating funds will be requested or required to support the facility.

Project 85–ER–133, the Advanced Science Center, University of Oregon, the Committee recommends $22,900,000 to continue and complete Federal support for this advanced science and technology center. In fiscal year 1985, the Department provided a grant for design and related activities for the science facility under authority of Public Law 93–438 and Public Law 98–360. The Committee recommends funds to continue the work initiated in fiscal year 1986 to proceed on the facility. It is the Committee's understanding that the Department has thoroughly reviewed the project, that substantial non-Federal contributions will be committed to the project, and that no continuing operating funds will be requested or required to support the facility.

Project 84–ER–112, the Center for Advanced Materials, University of California, the Committee includes $10,560,000 to continue construction of this facility, which is the same as the budget request and the House allowance. The Committee believes that establishment of a center for materials research with a strong technology focus and industry participation offers the potential for significant advances in this important field.

For chemical science, the recommendation includes $101,404,000, the same as the budget request and $5,630,000 over the House allowance.

For applied mathematical science, the Committee recommends $44,885,000, which is $11,000,000 over the budget request and the same as the House allowance. The recommendation includes $11,400,000 which will continue to fulfill the Federal share of an agreement with the Supercomputer Computational Research Institute at Florida State University.

Project 86–R–500, the Center for Information Technology, Brown University, the Committee includes $5,000,000 to continue and complete Federal support for this important facility which began in fiscal year 1986. It is the Committee's understanding that substantial non-Federal contributions will be committed to the project and no continuing operating funds will be requested to support the facility.

For engineering and geoscience, the recommendation provides $35,862,000, which is $4,700,000 over the budget request and $11,600,000 below the House allowance.

The Committee is seriously concerned about the precipitous drop in oil and gas exploration and development activities and the cutback in

petroleum industry funded research in this area. The Committee believes this will reduce the future supply of trained scientists and engineers, and will fail to provide the requisite technology for finding and producting the more difficult resources of domestic oil and gas needed for our country's future energy demands. DOE projects that over 50 percent of the U.S. energy demand in the year 2000 will still be met from oil and gas; whatever is not produced domestically must be imported. The Committee believes that there is the need for a strong and continuing Federal role in petroleum based geosciences, and that the Department's budget justification for research in the geosciences associated with oil and gas exploration and recovery is deficient. The Committee directs the Department to submit a report on a 5-year research program in geosciences related to the discovery and recovery of domestic oil and gas resources by January 1, 1987; DOE should coordinate the report with USGS and the ERAB solid Earth sciences panel. The Committee provides an additional $3,000,000 in the geosciences program in basic energy sciences for this type of geoscientific research.

For biological energy research, the Committee recommends $21,348,000, an increase of $6,200,000 above the budget request and $3,100,000 over the level in fiscal year 1986.

Federal support has laid the groundwork for significant advances in biotechnology. More long-term research, however, is needed to maintain technological leadership. The Committee has provided additional funding for an enhanced research effort in the area of bioprocessing. An amount of $1,200,000 is provided to continue and enhance fundamental research at the OGC in the biological and biochemical sciences, particularly in the area of biomass bioprocessing as proposed by the House.

The Committee is aware of the Department's continuing interest in the research of complex carbohydrates, and concurs that adequate resources should be devoted to this important program in the future. The Department should negotiate with the Department of Agriculture to secure appropriate space in existing facilities for the complex carbohydrate program at the University of Georgia. The Committee understands that space is available and expects the Department of Energy to provide the Committee with a cost estimate and implementation schedule to refurbish facilities, including appropriate laboratory space for continuation of complex carbohydrate studies.

For the new basic energy science facilities included in the House allowance, the Committee provides funding for needed research, design, and related activities as follows: the Center for New Industrial Materials, $1,700,000; the Center for Nuclear Imaging Research, $1,200,000; and the Energy Research Complex, $1,700,000. In addition, the Committee recommends $3,000,000 for advanced design and related activities for the Center for Science and Engineering Technology, Project 87–R–410. The recommendation also includes funding for new facilities at laboratories including the 1–2 GeV Synchrotron Radiation Source at LBL and the 6 GeV Synchrotron Radiation Source at

Argonne, and $2,500,000 the same as the budget request is included for preconstruction R&D on the Advanced Steady State Research Reactor at Oak Ridge.

University research support.—The Committee continues to be concerned over the continued use of highly enriched uranium at university research reactors. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission recently issued a rule for converting these reactors to low-enriched uranium [LEU]. The Committee is aware that a number of universities have converted or plan to convert to LEU. To further encourage these efforts, the Committee provides $3,900,000, an increase of $2,000,000 above the budget, for LEU fuel assistance to universities.

Multiprogram facilities.—The recommendation includes $31,440,000 for multiprogram lab facilities support, $3,495,000 below the budget request and $8,621,000 more than the current level.

Cooperative programs.—The Committee supports the cooperative programs which enhance collaboration between the national laboratories and leading research universities. For years, the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, the Ana G. Mendez Education Foundation, and Jackson State University have enjoyed a productive relationship intended to enhance computer science, scientific research, and academic programs at the institutions. The Committee is encouraged by the success of this effort, and the Department is directed to provide $1,500,000 from basic energy sciences in fiscal year 1986 to enhance and support this relationship.

The following tabulation shows the Committee's recommendation by program for new budget authority in comparison with the current year, the budget estimate, and the House allowance:

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT				
SOLAR ENERGY				
I. Solar applications				
A. Solar building energy systems				
Operating expenses	7,700,000	4,700,000	4,700,000	7,200,000
Capital equipment	481,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Solar building energy systems	8,181,000	4,700,000	4,700,000	7,200,000
B. Photovoltaic energy systems				
Operating expenses	39,523,000	19,600,000	34,600,000	39,600,000
Capital equipment	1,155,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Construction - (84-CE-001)	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Photovoltaic energy systems	40,678,000	20,600,000	35,600,000	40,600,000

C. Solar thermal energy systems				
Operating expenses	25,596,000	15,300,000	23,000,000	20,000,000
Capital equipment	289,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Solar thermal energy system	25,885,000	15,300,000	23,000,000	20,000,000
D. Biofuels energy systems				
Operating expenses	26,749,000	11,600,000	19,600,000	26,400,000
Capital equipment	577,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
Subtotal, Biofuels energy systems	27,326,000	12,200,000	20,200,000	27,000,000
E. Wind energy systems				
Operating expenses	12,055,000	8,080,000	12,080,000	12,080,000
Mod 5-B	12,000,000	---	4,500,000	4,500,000
Capital equipment	770,000	170,000	170,000	170,000
Subtotal, Wind energy systems	24,825,000	8,250,000	16,750,000	16,750,000
F. Ocean energy systems				
Operating expenses	4,811,000	2,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
Subtotal, Solar applications	131,706,000	63,550,000	104,750,000	116,050,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. Other solar energy				
A. International solar energy program - OE.....	962,000	500,000	500,000	1,000,000
B Solar technology transfer				
Operating expenses.....	2,983,000	1,950,000	2,450,000	2,450,000
Capital equipment.....	---	50,000	50,000	50,000
Subtotal, Solar technology transfer.....	2,983,000	2,000,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
D. Solar Energy Research Institute				
Capital equipment.....	251,000	315,000	315,000	315,000
Construction:				
General plant projects.....	1,993,000	230,000	230,000	230,000
Subtotal, Solar Energy Research Institute.....	2,244,000	545,000	545,000	545,000

F. Resource assessment				
Operating expenses	914,000	700,000	500,000	700,000
Capital equipment	48,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Resource assessment	962,000	700,000	500,000	700,000
G. Program support - OE	1,251,000	897,000	500,000	897,000
H. Program direction - OE	4,516,000	4,100,000	4,100,000	4,100,000
Subtotal, Other solar energy	12,918,000	8,742,000	8,645,000	9,742,000
TOTAL, SOLAR ENERGY	144,624,000	72,292,000	113,395,000	125,792,000
(Operating expenses)	(139,060,000)	(69,927,000)	(111,030,000)	(123,427,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(5,564,000)	(2,365,000)	(2,365,000)	(2,365,000)
GEOTHERMAL				
I. Hydrothermal industrialization				
Operating expenses	1,925,000	---	---	2,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. Geopressured resources				
Operating expenses	4,426,000	17,150,000	17,150,000	4,000,000
III. Geothermal technology development				
Operating expenses	19,548,000	---	---	14,150,000
Capital equipment	481,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Geothermal technology development	20,029,000	---	---	14,150,000
V. Program direction - OE	701,000	780,000	780,000	780,000
Management initiatives - OE	-400,000	---	---	---
TOTAL, GEOTHERMAL	26,681,000	17,930,000	17,930,000	20,930,000
(Operating expenses)	(26,200,000)	(17,930,000)	(17,930,000)	(20,930,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(481,000)	---	---	---

HYDROPOWER				
I. Small scale hydropower development - OE.....	436,000	---	---	405,000
III. Program direction - OE.....	45,000	---	---	45,000
TOTAL, HYDROPOWER.....	481,000	---	---	450,000
ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE				
I. Electric energy systems				
A. Electric field effects research				
Operating expenses.....	2,887,000	7,269,000	5,269,000	5,269,000
Capital equipment.....	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Electric field effects research.....	2,887,000	7,269,000	5,269,000	5,269,000
B. Reliability research				
Operating expenses.....	2,887,000	---	2,000,000	2,000,000
C. System technology				
Operating expenses.....	5,418,000	---	3,700,000	3,700,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Program direction - OE	356,000	350,000	350,000	350,000
E. Program support	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Electric energy systems	11,548,000	7,619,000	11,319,000	11,319,000
II. Energy Storage Systems				
A. Battery storage				
Operating expenses	13,828,000	8,600,000	12,300,000	12,300,000
Capital equipment	192,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Battery storage	14,020,000	8,600,000	12,300,000	12,300,000
B. Thermal and mechanical storage				
Operating expenses	2,945,000	---	4,000,000	4,000,000

C. Program direction - OE	327,000	---	400,000	400,000
Subtotal, Energy storage systems	17,292,000	8,600,000	16,700,000	16,700,000
TOTAL, ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE	28,840,000	16,219,000	28,019,000	28,019,000
(Operating expenses)	(28,648,000)	(16,219,000)	(28,019,000)	(28,019,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(192,000)	---	---	---
I. NUCLEAR ENERGY R&D				
A. Light water reactor				
Operating expense	48,158,000	41,000,000	38,000,000	33,000,000
Capital equipment	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Light water reactor	48,158,000	41,000,000	38,000,000	33,000,000
B. Advanced reactor R & D				
Operating expense	123,432,000	47,000,000	62,000,000	83,000,000
Capital equipment	5,118,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Subtotal, Advanced reactor R & D	128,550,000	49,500,000	64,500,000	85,500,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Space & defense power systems				
Operating expense	16,367,000	60,370,000	48,370,000	27,370,000
Capital equipment	1,924,000	6,280,000	5,280,000	5,280,000
Construction:				
86-N-105 SP-100 fac. mods - HEDL	1,924,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Subtotal, Space & defense power systems	20,215,000	71,650,000	58,650,000	37,650,000
D. Advanced nuclear systems				
Operating expense	17,854,000	20,600,000	17,600,000	17,600,000
Capital equipment	1,636,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Subtotal, Advanced nuclear systems	19,490,000	23,600,000	20,600,000	20,600,000
E. Facilities				
Operating expense	124,173,000	115,200,000	121,200,000	121,200,000
Capital equipment	4,503,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000

Construction:				
87-N-101 Mods to reactors.....	962,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
87-N-102 GPP.....	1,732,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
85-N-602 ANAL, INEL, ID, security upgrades...	866,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
83-N-334 Safeguards & sec. Assess, imp., ANL, INEL,ID.....	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, construction.....	3,560,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
Subtotal, Facilities.....	132,236,000	121,800,000	127,800,000	127,800,000
F. Water cooled breeder				
Operating expense.....	18,955,000	13,800,000	13,800,000	13,800,000
G. Program direction - OE.....	8,080,000	9,550,000	7,550,000	9,500,000
Subtotal, NUCLEAR ENERGY R & D.....	375,684,000	330,900,000	330,900,000	327,850,000
(Operating expense).....	(357,019,000)	(307,520,000)	(308,520,000)	(305,470,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(18,665,000)	(23,380,000)	(22,380,000)	(22,380,000)

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. Remedial actions & Waste technology				
1. Formerly utilized sites remedial action program				
Operating expenses	18,763,000	25,400,000	23,400,000	25,400,000
Capital equipment	192,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Subtotal, Formerly utilized sites remedial action program	18,955,000	25,600,000	23,600,000	25,600,000
2. Grand Junction remedial action DE	866,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
3. Uranium program mill tailings remedial action program				
Operating expenses	90,397,000	123,700,000	113,700,000	121,700,000
Capital equipment	962,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
Subtotal, Uranium program mill tailings remedial action program	91,359,000	126,000,000	116,000,000	124,000,000

4. Surplus facilities				
Operating expenses	39,787,000	56,000,000	50,000,000	44,000,000
Capital equipment	144,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
Subtotal, Management of surplus radioactivity contaminated DOE facilities	39,931,000	56,400,000	50,400,000	44,400,000
5. West Valley				
Operating expenses	61,581,000	79,000,000	79,000,000	79,000,000
6. Low level waste				
Operating expenses	4,474,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Capital equipment	96,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Low level waste	4,570,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
7. Waste technology & By-products				
Operating expenses	10,584,000	---	5,000,000	2,000,000
Capital equipment	433,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Waste technology & By-products	11,017,000	---	5,000,000	2,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
8. Program direction - OE.....	1,768,000	2,300,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
Subtotal, Remedial actions & Waste technology....	230,047,000	294,100,000	280,900,000	281,900,000
(Operating expenses).....	(228,220,000)	(291,200,000)	(278,000,000)	(279,000,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(1,827,000)	(2,900,000)	(2,900,000)	(2,900,000)
OFFICE OF CIVILIAN RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT				
IX. Civilian waste R&D				
A. Spent Fuel Storage R & D				
Operating expenses.....	7,496,000	6,300,000	6,300,000	6,300,000
Capital equipment.....	1,058,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Spent fuel storage R & D.....	8,554,000	6,300,000	6,300,000	6,300,000
B. Alternative disposal concepts				

Operating expenses	5,292,000	---	---	---
Capital equipment	1,915,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Alternative disposal concepts	7,207,000	---	---	---
C. Generic methods & supporting studies				
Operating expenses	---	---	---	---
E. Program direction	303,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Subtotal, Civilian waste R&D	16,064,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000
TOTAL, NUCLEAR	621,795,000	631,500,000	618,300,000	616,250,000
(Operating expenses)	(598,330,000)	(605,220,000)	(593,020,000)	(590,970,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(23,465,000)	(26,280,000)	(25,280,000)	(25,280,000)
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH				
I. Environment, safety and health				
Operating expenses	45,478,000	73,998,000	55,835,000	63,998,000
Capital equipment	1,443,000	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
Total, Environment safety and health	46,921,000	76,098,000	57,935,000	66,098,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
LIQUIFIED GASEOUS SPILL TEST FACILITY				
I. Spill test facility				
Operating expenses	1,732,000	1,200,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Construction	---	---	---	---
Total, Spill test facility	1,732,000	1,200,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
ENVIRONMENT R & D				
I. Biological and Environmental Research				
Operating expenses	166,237,000	180,965,000	175,965,000	175,965,000
Capital equipment	7,457,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
Construction:				
87-R-120 General plant projects, various locations	3,127,000	3,500,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
87-R-130 Institute of Nuclear Medicine, New Jersey	---	---	---	3,000,000

Subtotal, Biological and environ. research.....	176,821,000	192,965,000	187,465,000	190,465,000
II. Program direction - OE.....				
A. Bio and env. research - PD.....	3,129,000	3,600,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
Total, Environment R & D.....	179,950,000	196,565,000	191,065,000	194,065,000
(Operating expenses).....	(169,366,000)	(184,565,000)	(179,565,000)	(179,565,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(10,584,000)	(12,000,000)	(11,500,000)	(14,500,000)
FUSION				
I. Magnetic fusion				
A. Confinement systems				
Operating expenses.....	188,650,000	177,500,000	202,500,000	177,500,000
Capital equipment.....	14,529,000	7,100,000	7,100,000	7,100,000
Subtotal, Confinement systems.....	203,179,000	184,600,000	209,600,000	184,600,000
B. Development and technology				
Operating expenses.....	57,059,000	50,510,000	50,510,000	50,510,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Capital equipment	4,330,000	1,890,000	1,890,000	1,890,000
Subtotal, Development and technology	61,389,000	52,400,000	52,400,000	52,400,000
C. Applied plasma physics				
Operating expenses	69,692,000	70,700,000	70,700,000	70,700,000
Capital equipment	5,619,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
Subtotal, Applied plasma physics	75,311,000	75,200,000	75,200,000	75,200,000
D. Planning and projects				
Operating expenses	5,528,000	4,780,000	4,780,000	4,780,000
Capital equipment	3,801,000	3,820,000	3,820,000	3,820,000
Construction:				
87-R-901 General plant projects, various locations	8,764,000	8,200,000	8,200,000	8,200,000
78-3-A Mirror fusion test facility	3,889,000	---	---	---

78-3-B Fusion materials irradiation test facility, Hanford engineering lab,WA.....	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction.....	12,653,000	8,200,000	8,200,000	8,200,000
Subtotal, Planning and projects.....	21,982,000	16,800,000	16,800,000	16,800,000
F. Program direction - OE.....	3,608,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Total, Fusion.....	365,469,000	333,000,000	358,000,000	333,000,000
(Operating expenses).....	(324,537,000)	(307,490,000)	(332,490,000)	(307,490,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(40,932,000)	(25,510,000)	(25,510,000)	(25,510,000)
SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS				
I. Basic energy sciences				
A. Nuclear sciences				
Operating expenses.....	41,445,000	46,913,000	46,913,000	46,913,000
Capital equipment.....	2,457,000	2,930,000	2,930,000	2,930,000
Construction:				
87-R-400 General plant projects, various locations.....	96,000	150,000	150,000	150,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
87-R-401 Accelerator and Reactor Improvements and modifications, various locations..	1,155,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Nuclear sciences.....	45,153,000	49,993,000	49,993,000	49,993,000
B. Materials sciences				
Operating expenses.....	134,248,000	156,931,000	156,931,000	155,031,000
Capital equipment.....	11,979,000	15,500,000	15,500,000	15,500,000
Construction:				
87-R-401 Accelerator and reactor improvements and modifications, various locations..	1,727,000	2,583,000	2,583,000	2,583,000
87-R-403 Neutron Scattering experimental halls, Los Alamos, New Mexico.....	---	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
87-R-406 1-2 GeV stnch rod SC,LBL.....	---	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
87-R- Center for New Industrial Materials, Iowa State University.....	---	---	6,000,000	1,700,000

85-ER-133 Advanced Science Center, Univ of Oregon	8,179,000	---	---	22,900,000
86-R-300 Center for Technology, Atlanta Univ	4,330,000	---	7,500,000	5,500,000
84-ER-111 NSLS	6,928,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
84-ER-112 Center for advanced material	11,008,000	10,560,000	10,560,000	10,560,000
84-ER-113 SSRL enhancement	2,463,000	1,717,000	1,717,000	1,717,000
84-ER-114 Vitreous state laboratory	---	---	---	---
84-ER-115 Nat'l center for chemical research	7,698,000	---	4,000,000	4,000,000
Subtotal, Construction	42,333,000	23,960,000	41,460,000	58,060,000
Subtotal, Materials sciences	188,560,000	196,391,000	213,891,000	228,591,000
C. Chemical sciences				
Operating expenses	78,123,000	86,419,000	81,419,000	86,419,000
Capital equipment	8,506,000	9,555,000	9,555,000	9,555,000
Construction:				
87-R-400 General plant projects, various locations	3,781,000	3,630,000	3,000,000	3,630,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
87-R-401 Accelerator and reactor improvements and modifications, various locations..	---	300,000	300,000	300,000
87-R-405 Combustion research facility, Phase II, Sandia National Laboratories, Livermore, California.....	---	300,000	300,000	300,000
85-ER-403 Kansas State University.....	1,828,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
Subtotal, Construction.....	5,609,000	5,430,000	4,800,000	5,430,000
Subtotal, Chemical sciences.....	92,238,000	101,404,000	95,774,000	101,404,000
E. Applied mathematical sciences				
Operating expenses.....	37,925,000	32,785,000	38,785,000	38,785,000
Capital equipment.....	1,030,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
Construction: Demo ctr for info tech, Brown...	4,811,000	---	5,000,000	5,000,000
Subtotal, Applied mathematical sciences.....	43,766,000	33,885,000	44,885,000	44,885,000

F. Engineering and geosciences				
Operating expenses	25,571,000	29,412,000	29,412,000	29,412,000
Capital equipment	1,443,000	1,750,000	1,750,000	1,750,000
Construction:				
87-R-40 Center for Science and Engineering				
87-R-410 Arizona State Univ	---	---	---	3,000,000
87-R- Energy Research Complex, Univ. of				
South Carolina	---	---	16,300,000	1,700,000
Subtotal, Engineering and geosciences	27,014,000	31,162,000	47,462,000	35,862,000
G. Advanced energy projects				
Operating expenses	7,286,000	8,932,000	5,000,000	8,932,000
Capital equipment	308,000	330,000	330,000	330,000
Subtotal, Advanced energy projects	7,594,000	9,262,000	5,330,000	9,262,000
H. Biological energy research				
Operating expenses	11,960,000	14,538,000	14,538,000	19,538,000
Capital equipment	515,000	610,000	610,000	610,000
Construction:				
Ctr for Energy and Biomed Tech, Tulane	5,773,000	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Center for Nuclear Imaging Research.....	---	---	12,300,000	1,200,000
St. Christopher's Hospital for Children energy demonstration project.....	---	---	14,800,000	---
Subtotal, Biological energy research.....	18,248,000	15,148,000	42,248,000	21,348,000
I. Program direction - OE.....	3,499,000	4,125,000	4,125,000	4,125,000
Subtotal, Basic energy sciences.....	426,072,000	441,370,000	503,708,000	495,470,000
(Operating expenses).....	(340,057,000)	(380,055,000)	(377,123,000)	(389,155,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(86,015,000)	(61,315,000)	(126,585,000)	(106,315,000)
II. Energy oversight, research analy. & Univ support				
A. Energy research analysis - OE				
1. Assessment projects.....	2,598,000	3,550,000	2,000,000	3,550,000

B. University research support - OE				
Operating expenses:				
2. University reactor fuel assistance.....	3,753,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	3,900,000
3. University laboratory coop. progra.....	5,773,000	7,075,000	5,075,000	7,075,000
5. Energy manpower assessment progra.....	385,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
6. Education and training.....	385,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
7. Visiting scientist progra.....	---	700,000	700,000	700,000
8. Center for Excellence in Education.....	---	---	3,800,000	---
Subtotal, University research support - OE.....	10,296,000	10,975,000	12,775,000	12,975,000
C. Advisory and oversight - OE.....	2,674,000	2,900,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
D. University research instrumentation.....	6,254,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Subtotal, Energy oversight, res analy, & Univ sup	21,822,000	22,425,000	22,275,000	24,025,000
Multiprogram Energy Laboratories - Fac. Sup.				
A. Multiprogram general purpose facilities				
Construction:				
87-R-751 Lab res. 1 at PNL.....	---	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
87-R-752 Piping sys. res. at ORNL.....	---	725,000	725,000	725,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
87-R-753 Rehab. lab space at ANL.....	---	1,235,000	1,235,000	1,235,000
87-R-755 Mech. sys. rehab. at ANL.....	---	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
87-R-756 Water line rep. at ANL.....	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
87-R-757 Elec. sys. rehab. at LBL.....	---	300,000	300,000	300,000
87-R-758 Rehab. mech. util. at LBL.....	---	1,050,000	1,050,000	1,050,000
87-R-759 Upgrade steam dist. sys. at ORNL....	---	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
86-R-726 Fire protection improvements (BNL)..	481,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
86-R-727 Upgrade fire protection (ORNL).....	---	---	---	---
85-R-701 Central chilled water facility (BNL)	6,832,000	5,700,000	5,700,000	5,700,000
85-R-702 Replace laboratory roofs (ANL).....	2,983,000	2,392,000	2,392,000	2,392,000

85-R-703 Electrical dist. system restoration	---	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
85-R-704 Rehabilitate underground steam syste	---	---	---	---
85-R-706 Medical facility (LLNL).....	2,694,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
85-R-707 Hanford site fire alarm system upgra	1,708,000	1,225,000	1,225,000	1,225,000
85-R-709 Central chilled water plant (ANL)...	962,000	3,600,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
85-R-711 Upgrade envir. monitoring system (OR	2,406,000	---	---	---
85-R-712 Central chilled water system restor	1,058,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
84-ER-101 Rehab. old utilities (LBL).....	---	---	---	---
84-ER-102 Cooling water facility, Restor. (ORNL).....	---	---	---	---
84-ER-103 Road repair (various locations)....	2,973,000	2,008,000	2,008,000	2,008,000
83-E-308 Rep power sys,INEL,LLNL,ORNL,RL.....	---	---	---	---
83-E-309 Electronics fac., ANL.....	---	---	---	---
83-E-310 Utility replacements.....	---	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
82-E-302 Security facility (ANL).....	---	---	---	---
80-ES-11 Idaho Lab Facility (INEL).....	722,000	---	---	---
Anticipated project slippage.....	---	---	-3,495,000	-3,495,000
Subtotal, Multi-program facilities.....	22,819,000	34,935,000	31,440,000	31,440,000
B. Environmental compliance				
Operating expenses.....	9,307,000	14,255,000	14,255,000	14,255,000
Capital Equipment.....	962,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Construction:				
87-R-770 General Plant Projects (ORNL).....	3,849,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Upgrade, Phase II (ORNL).....	---	---	---	---
86-R-801 Nonradiological process waste treat	2,887,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
Subtotal, Construction.....	6,736,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000

Subtotal, Environmental Compliance Program.....	17,005,000	25,255,000	25,255,000	25,255,000
Total, Multiprogram Laboratories Facilities Suppo	39,824,000	60,190,000	56,695,000	56,695,000
IV. Small business innovation research program.....	---	---	---	---
Total, Supporting research and tech. analysis....	487,718,000	523,985,000	582,678,000	576,190,000
(Operating expenses).....	(371,186,000)	(416,735,000)	(413,653,000)	(427,435,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(116,532,000)	(107,250,000)	(169,025,000)	(148,755,000)

POLICY AND MANAGEMENT

I. Policy and Management				
A. Policy and management - OE - ER.....	84,000	550,000	550,000	550,000
B. Policy and management - OE - NE.....	1,732,000	1,810,000	1,810,000	1,810,000
C. Policy and management - CE.....	1,681,000	1,527,000	1,527,000	1,527,000
Subtotal, Policy and management.....	3,497,000	3,887,000	3,887,000	3,887,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ENERGY APPLICATIONS				
Technical Information & Management Program				
Operating expenses	13,072,000	13,848,000	13,848,000	12,848,000
Capital equipment	550,000	850,000	850,000	850,000
Support from other programs	-1,209,000	-3,923,000	-3,923,000	-3,923,000
Subtotal, Technical Information & Management Pros	12,413,000	10,775,000	10,775,000	9,775,000
II. In-house energy management				
Operating expenses	1,895,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Construction:				
87-A-601 Modification for energy mgmt., vario	4,811,000	9,003,000	9,003,000	9,003,000
86-A-602 Solid waste fired boiler (LANCL)	1,732,000	5,868,000	5,868,000	5,868,000
86-A-603 Energy monitoring and control syste	---	---	---	---

86-A-604 Waste heat recovery (INL).....	---	---	---	---
85-A-602 Fuel storage facility, BNL.....	1,443,000	57,000	57,000	57,000
85-A-604 Combustion air preheaters, energy te	1,828,000	72,000	72,000	72,000
85-A-606 Cogeneration facility, BNL.....	4,811,000	---	---	---
General reduction (In-House).....	-4,811,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction.....	9,814,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
Subtotal, In-house energy management.....	11,709,000	16,500,000	16,500,000	16,500,000
Subtotal, Energy applications.....	24,122,000	27,275,000	27,275,000	26,275,000
SUBTOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.....	1,931,830,000	1,899,951,000	2,000,484,000	1,992,956,000
Adjustments:				
Use of prior year balances - (NE) ESRD.....	-19,302,000	---	---	-5,700,000
Use of prior year balances - (CE) ESRD.....	-950,000	---	---	---
Less proposed transfer for ES&H - (DP) AEDA.....	-5,617,000	---	---	---
Less proposed transfer for ES&H - (NE) UE.....	-250,000	---	---	---

URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES

PROGRAM COSTS

Appropriations, 1986	$1,551,112,000
Budget estimate, 1987	1,286,400,000
House allowance	1,256,400,000
Committee recommendation	1,286,400,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	+30,000,000

GROSS REVENUES

Appropriations, 1986	−$1,360,600,000
Budget estimate, 1987	−1,286,400,000
House allowance	−1,286,400,000
Committee recommendation	−1,286,400,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

This appropriation provides for expenses of the Department of Energy in connection with operating expenses, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other related incidental expenses necessary for uranium supply and enrichment activities. In this account, the revenues received from the enrichment of uranium are retained and used to offset costs incurred by the Department in providing uranium enrichment and other services.

The Committee recommends $1,286,400,000 for uranium supply and enrichment activities, the same as the budget request and $30,000,000 over the House allowance. The recommendation also assumes revenues of $1,286,400,000 to be used to offset the costs of the program.

The Committee recognizes that the Department's Uranium Enrichment Program is an ongoing activity subject to fluctuations in both the demand for these services and the conditions under which they must be supplied. The Committee believes the Department has made good progress in stabilizing its program and operating it on a more business-like basis, but more progress is needed. Thus, the Committee expects the Department to continue to work toward structuring the enterprise to assure its long-term financial integrity, and to further stabilize the policies already put in place. The Department should move as quickly as possible to address these issues.

Privatization.—Privatization of the uranium enrichment enterprise has been proposed by several administrations for a number of years with varying degrees of enthusiasm. The lack of enthusiasm by potential private sector investors in large measure is due to uncertainties surrounding the enterprise.

Customer uncertainty over prices and availability, inability to assure a long-term customer base, continuing questions over the total debt and repayment obligations and uncertainty over the possibility of introducing competitive, alternative enrichment technologies to meet foreign cost competition have served to contribute to further erosion of the U.S. uranium enrichment enterprise.

Since the Department has agreed that privatization will not be undertaken without prior congressional approval, the opportunity should be given to the Department to fully evaluate privatization options. The Committee believes that an evaluation of alternatives to the present program could be productive in developing methods to reduce uncertainties and stabilize enrichment policies. Therefore, funds are available in fiscal year 1987 for evaluating privatization alternatives.

Advanced technologies.—The Committee recommendation provides $80,000,000 to continue the AVLIS demonstration and development activity on the schedule presented to and agreed to by the Congress in fiscal year 1986. This would permit a deployment decision by fiscal year 1991–92 and assure the continued existence of an alternative, lower cost enrichment technology. Funds are included under project No. 81–T–502 to expand facilities to provide for development, refurbishment, and administrative activities necessary for full-scale demonstration and economic evaluation of the AVLIS uranium enrichment technology prior to production deployment.

In addition, the Committee believes that the Department should proceed with plans to initiate an industrial access program that would familiarize the private sector with AVLIS technology and thus enhance the development of a competitive cost-effective industrial base that will be a crucial element in the timely deployment of AVLIS.

Gaseous diffusion operation.—The recommendation includes $977,300,000 for GDP operations, the same as the budget request. This amount will provide adequate production capability and maintain the gaseous diffusion plants in a safe and environmentally acceptable condition.

Repayment.—The Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 establishes the concept of repayment of certain prior-year net appropriations from uranium enrichment revenues to the Treasury. The act stipulated that the Secretary of Energy determine the appropriate repayment amount, that the public be afforded an opportunity to comment on that amount, and that the Secretary submit that determination to the Congress prior to submission of the budget for the fiscal year in which the repayment is proposed to be made. Since neither the determination, the public comment, nor the submission prior to delivery of the fiscal year 1986 and 1987 budgets was made in accordance with the conditions set forth in the Omnibus Reconciliation Act, the ability to repay the Treasury is in doubt. In light of pending litigation and adverse court rulings affecting the Uranium Enrichment Program, the Committee has recommended no action be taken in regard to the proposal to repay funds in fiscal year 1986 and 1987, and has placed the target amount in reserve pending subsequent legislative action and satisfactory resolution of these issues and statutory requirements by the Department.

The Secretary should assure compliance with the provisions of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act that the amount of repayment have no adverse impact on the supply of enriched material at competitive prices to existing and potential customers.

The Committee is concerned about the conflicting estimates of the enrichment programs' debt that is due to the Treasury by the civilian customers of the Department of Energy. The Committee believes that it is inappropriate to include the capital assets and accrued interest on such assets in the debt calculation since the assets are still owned by the Government. In addition, the Committee believes that between 1969 and 1984, the funds spent on enrichment for defense needs were improperly assigned to the civilian customers of the Department and thus to civilian ratepayers.

With the segregation of assets and debt, and the reassignment of costs attributable to defense needs of enriched uranium, the Department testified that the cash-outlay debt to the Treasury from the civilian customers is of the amount $350,000,000.

The following table shows the Committee's recommendation by program:

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Less proposed transfer for ES&H - (ER) GS.....	-300,000	---	---	---
Addback of proposed FTE reductions - (CE) ESRD.....	65,000	---	---	---
Addback of proposed FTE reductions - (ME) ESRD.....	183,000	---	---	---
Addback of proposed FTE reductions - (CRW) ESRD.....	6,000	---	---	---
Addback of proposed FTE reductions - (ESH) ESRD.....	12,000	---	---	---
Addback of proposed FTE reductions - (ER) ESRD.....	317,000	---	---	---
Addback of proposed FTE reductions - (MA) ESRD.....	6,000	---	---	---
Use of FY86 Deferral - (CE)ESRD.....	---	-23,351,000	---	---
Use of FY86 Deferral - (ER)ESRD.....	---	-38,280,000	---	---
Use of PY balances (from UE).....	-200,000,000	-584,158,000	-684,158,000	-668,458,000
Use of prior year balances - SEPA.....	-17,400,000	---	---	---
Transfers (LRF).....	---	---	---	---
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.....	1,688,600,000	1,254,162,000	1,316,326,000	1,318,798,000
(Operating expenses).....	(1,479,043,000)	(1,062,807,000)	(1,064,696,000)	(1,084,438,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(209,557,000)	(191,355,000)	(251,630,000)	(234,360,000)

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
URANIUM ENRICHMENT				
I. Uranium enrichment activities				
A. Gaseous diffusion and operations support				
Operating expenses.....	1,043,063,000	977,300,000	1,002,300,000	977,300,000
Capital equipment.....	13,472,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Construction:				
87-N-501 General plant projects.....	13,467,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
87-N-502 Cooling tower upgrading Paducah, KY.	---	6,300,000	6,300,000	6,300,000
84-N-403 Intermediate gas removal.....	---	---	---	---
84-N-404 Power systems protection impr.....	1,154,000	---	---	---
84-N-405 Utilities upgrading, Phase III.....	2,116,000	6,800,000	6,800,000	6,800,000
83-N-402 Compli. with toxic sub. Control act, gas dif. plants.....	---	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
83-N-405 Utilities upgrading, Phase II, gas. dif. plant.....	1,731,000	---	---	---
81-R-506 Environmental protection and safety improvements, Phase I GDP's.....	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction.....	18,468,000	14,300,000	14,300,000	14,300,000
Subtotal, Gaseous diffusion operations and suppo	1,075,003,000	992,600,000	1,017,600,000	992,600,000
B. Atomic vapor laser isotope separation				
Operating expenses.....	109,660,000	50,000,000	72,500,000	72,500,000
Capital equipment.....	14,429,000	---	---	---
Construction:				
87-N-503 General plant projects, various loc	2,886,000	---	---	---
81-T-502 demonstration facilites.....	---	---	7,500,000	7,500,000
Subtotal, Atomic vapor laser isotope separation	126,975,000	50,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Gas centrifuge program closeout activities				
1. Gas centrifuge process development & demo				
Operating expenses	17,315,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Capital equipment	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Gas Centrifuge	17,315,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
2. Gas centriuge enrichment plant				
Operating expenses	---	---	---	---
Capital equipment	---	---	---	---
Construction:				
76-8-G Enriched Uranium production facility, Portsmouth, OH	327,057,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Gas centrifuge enrichment plant	327,057,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Gas centrifugr closeout activities	344,372,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Program direction - OE	4,036,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
Addback of proposed transfer for ES&H	250,000	---	---	---
Addback of proposed transfer FTE reduction	476,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Uranium enrichment activities	1,551,112,000	1,051,400,000	1,106,400,000	1,081,400,000
Reserve	---	235,000,000	150,000,000	---
TOTAL URANIUM ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES	1,551,112,000	1,286,400,000	1,256,400,000	1,081,400,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,174,800,000)	(1,271,100,000)	(1,233,600,000)	(1,058,600,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(376,312,000)	(15,300,000)	(22,800,000)	(22,800,000)
III. Offsetting revenues				
Operating expenses	-1,326,900,000	-1,286,400,000	-1,286,400,000	-1,286,400,000
Capital equipment	-14,500,000	---	---	---

General Science and Research Activities

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1986	$510,790,000
Budget estimate, 1987	604,900,000
House allowance	577,900,000
Committee recommendation	516,900,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−88,000,000
House allowance	−61,000,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1986	$145,138,000
Budget estimate, 1987	168,500,000
House allowance	160,500,000
Committee recommendation	160,500,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−8,000,000
House allowance	

The General Science Program is organized into interrelated scientific programs, high energy physics and nuclear physics. While these programs are not directly associated with energy technology in the near or mid-term, they support basic research whose aim is to provide new knowledge which is expected to have long-term scientific and technological impacts on energy development and utilization.

The Committee recommends $677,400,000 for general science and research activities, which is $61,000,000 below the House allowance, and $21,472,000 over the current level of funding.

High energy physics.—The Committee recommends $511,700,000 for high energy physics, an increase of $16,842,000 over the budget level for fiscal year 1986 and $8,000,000 below the House allowance. The Committee has supported a 7-year program to upgrade Fermilab and the completion of the Stanford Linear Collider. These premier facilities are the highest energy fixed target and collider of their respective type in the world. The Committee includes an increase of $20,305,000 over current levels for operating expenses. The reduction in operating below the budget request is due to budget constraints and to conform this program more closely to the levels proposed in the budget resolution.

The Committee does not agree with the House reduction for the Superconducting Super Collider project.

Project 86–R–105, AGS proton-heavy ion booster, Brookhaven National Laboratory, the Committee includes $3,500,000 for the alternating gradient synchrotron facility upgrade. The Committee agrees that the inclusion of these funds does not represent a commitment of any kind to a larger high energy physics facility at BNL.

Nuclear physics.—The recommendation includes $196,200,000 for nuclear physics activities, an increase of $31,728,000 over the current level which is a 19-percent increase from fiscal year 1986.

The Department presently supports seven national accelerator facilities in nuclear physics as well as four dedicated university accelerators.

The recommendation for operations and related expenses at these 11 nuclear physics accelerators in fiscal year 1987 is $154,900,000, which is slightly more than provided in fiscal year 1986. Reductions from the request for operating expenses are necessary due to general budget constraints. As indicated previously, the Committee remains concerned about the direction of the program particularly in view of future budget pressures and proposals for new accelerator facilities.

The following tabulation shows the Committee recommendation for each program and activity:

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction	-19,200,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Offsetting revenues	-1,360,600,000	-1,286,400,000	-1,286,400,000	-1,286,400,000
TOTAL, URANIUM ENRICHMENT	190,512,000	---	-30,000,000	-205,000,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,174,800,000)	(1,271,100,000)	(1,233,600,000)	(1,058,600,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(376,312,000)	(15,300,000)	(22,800,000)	(22,800,000)
(Offsetting revenues)	(-1,360,600,000)	(-1,286,400,000)	(-1,286,400,000)	(-1,286,400,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH				
I. High energy physics				
A. Physics research				
Operating expenses	106,268,000	118,600,000	111,600,000	111,600,000
B. Facility operations				
Operating expenses	175,095,000	213,400,000	213,400,000	195,400,000
Capital equipment	66,250,000	73,300,000	73,300,000	73,300,000
Construction:				
87-R-101 Accelerator improvements and modifications, various locations	10,052,000	11,500,000	11,500,000	11,500,000
87-R-102 General plant projects, various locations	9,957,000	11,200,000	11,200,000	11,200,000
86-R-104 Central Computer Fac. (FERMILAB)	2,968,000	14,157,000	15,500,000	14,157,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
86-R-100 AGS Accum/Booster.....	1,915,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
84-ER-133 SLAC linear collider (SLC).....	21,924,000	976,000	---	976,000
82-E-206 TEVATRON II.....	---	---	---	---
81-E-218 Tevatron I.....	8,233,000	367,000	---	367,000
Subtotal, Construction.....	55,049,000	41,700,000	41,700,000	41,700,000
Subtotal, Facility operations.....	296,394,000	328,400,000	328,400,000	310,400,000
C. High energy technology				
Operating expenses.....	88,462,000	95,500,000	75,500,000	85,500,000
D. Other capital equipment - CE.....	3,734,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000
Subtotal, High energy physics.....	494,858,000	546,700,000	519,700,000	511,700,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. Nuclear physics				
A. Medium energy physics				
Operating expenses	73,131,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	75,000,000
B. Heavy ion physics				
Operating expenses	50,150,000	63,700,000	63,700,000	55,700,000
C. Low energy nuclear physics				
Operating expenses	12,087,000	15,700,000	15,700,000	13,700,000
D. Nuclear theory				
Operating expenses	8,999,000	10,500,000	10,500,000	10,500,000
E. Capital equipment	12,637,000	14,770,000	14,770,000	14,770,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
F. Construction:				
87-R-201 Accelerator Improvements and modifications, various locations.....	3,351,000	4,300,000	4,300,000	4,300,000
87-R-202 General plant projects, various locations.....	3,351,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
87-R-403 Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility, Newport News, Virginia.....	---	25,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000
84-ER-110 Univ Accel upgrade.....	---	---	---	---
84-R-123 Tandem/AGS Heavy Ion Transfer Lines.	---	---	---	---
Subtotal Construction.....	6,702,000	33,300,000	25,300,000	25,300,000
G. Other capital equipment - CE.....	766,000	1,230,000	1,230,000	1,230,000
Subtotal, Nuclear physics.....	164,472,000	224,200,000	216,200,000	196,200,000

Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund

Appropriations, 1986	$499,037,000
Budget estimate, 1987	769,349,000
House allowance	677,649,000
Committee recommendation	380,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−389,349,000
House allowance	−297,649,000

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 establishes a program for siting and construction of deep geologic repositories and for submission to Congress of a proposal for one or more monitored, retrievable storage facilities. Funds for these activities are provided from the Nuclear Waste Fund, which received payments from electric utilities of 1 mil per kilowatt hour for electricity produced in nuclear powerplants. Expenditures from the Fund may be made only to the extent approved in advance in appropriations acts. The administration has requested $769,349,000 from the Nuclear Waste Fund for fiscal year 1987.

The Committee is deeply concerned with the current state of the nuclear waste program. Intense and widespread criticism, controversial programmatic decisions by the Secretary of Energy, and a proliferation of substantial litigation have taken a toll on progress toward the goals of the program. As a result, there is considerable uncertainty about the course of the program in the coming fiscal year. The Committee, therefore, is very reluctant to approve spending at the level originally requested by the administration. Numerous important Federal programs that are under stable management are being forced to accept funding cuts. Even without the present uncertainty, the nuclear waste program could not claim immunity from the requirement that Federal spending be reduced.

The Committee, therefore, provides $380,000,000 for the Nuclear Waste Disposal Program. This funding reduction is to be applied against the entire program efforts including site-specific activities for the first and second waste repositories and site-specific work at a monitored retrievable storage facility which is neither authorized nor funded.

The Committee believes that the surest course for the Department lies in the careful implementation of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act in close consultation with the affected parties, in particular, the affected States. The Committee, therefore, urges the Department to immediately undertake such consultation in hopes that pending litigation may be resolved in a timely manner. It seems obvious that a restoration of consensus is required before significant progress can be made and that many of the original deadlines of the act will not be met. The important task is the resolution of the numerous controversies in which the program is now embroiled and the restoration of confidence in the program. Only if such a restoration is forthcoming will the Committee consider any request to make additional resources available for elements of the program.

Atomic Energy Defense Activities

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1986	$5,738,153,000
Budget estimate, 1987	[1] 6,523,694,000
House allowance	6,233,994,000
Committee recommendation	5,772,094,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−751,600,000
House allowance	−461,900,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1986	$1,493,511,000
Budget estimate, 1987	[1] 1,706,306,000
House allowance	1,459,906,000
Committee recommendation	1,489,506,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−216,800,000
House allowance	+29,600,000

[1] Revised budget estimate of $7,658,000,000.

The Committee recommends a total appropriation of $7,261,600,000 for atomic energy defense activities. The Committee has been apprised that the administration budget request for the "Atomic energy defense activities" account has been revised to $7,658,000,000.

The appropriation recommended for atomic energy defense activities supports inertial confinement fusion, naval reactors development, the research, development, testing, production and stockpile maintenance for nuclear weapons, verification and control technology, special materials production, defense waste management and nuclear materials security and safeguards.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

The Committee recommends substantial increases in spending for the research, development, testing, production, and surveillance of nuclear weapons in order to meet national defense requirements. The budget includes funds for the production of six nuclear weapons systems—the B61–3 and –4 bombs, the W76 warhead for the Trident, the W80–0 warhead for the sea launched cruise missile, the W80–1 warhead for the air launched cruise missile, the B83 modern strategic bomb, the W84 warhead for the ground launched cruise missile, and the W87 warhead for the MX missile. Production was completed in fiscal year 1986 on two warheads—the W79 warhead for the artillery-fired atomic projectile and the W85 Pershing II missile warhead.

Efforts are also underway in anticipation of future production of a number of additional warheads and bombs including the W88 warhead for the Trident II missile and the W82 warhead for the 155 mm artillery projectile.

Research and development.—The Committee recommends $1,219,400,000 for research and development activities, an increase of $203,966,000 over the 1986 level and $20,500,000 below the budget request.

The recommendation for operating expenses includes $998,500,000 for an increase of about $201,549,000 over the fiscal year 1986 level and $17,800,000 over the budget request excluding ICF activities.

As proposed in the budget and recommended by the authorization committee, the research and development activities include funding for inertial confinement fusion research. This approach reflects the growing interplay between inertial fusion research and other nuclear weapons research, and also the increased utilization of inertial fusion facilities at the weapons laboratories for weapons research and development work. The Committee provides $154,000,000 for ICF activities which is the same as the House allowance. The recommendation includes $13,800,000 for the program at KMSF and $8,000,000 for activities at the University of Rochester.

The Committee provides $154,000,000 for ICF activities. The Committee recommends that DOE apportion the funding, taking into consideration the recommendation by the National Academy of Sciences.

Due to budget constraints, no funds are provided as proposed by the House for the Plasma Separation Program.

For the Strategic Defense Initiative activities within this account, the recommendation includes an increase of 3 percent over current year levels to a total amount of $341,000,000.

Project 87-D-101, general plant projects, the Committee recommends $21,300,000, the same as the House allowance.

Project 85-D-102, nuclear weapons research, development, and testing facilities revitalization, various locations, the recommendation includes $35,600,000 to continue this effort at the current level of effort. The Committee notes that many of the activities included in this project were a part of project 84-D-107, nuclear test facilities revitalization, various locations.

Project 82-D-144, simulation technology laboratory, the Committee provides $6,000,000 and agrees with the request level in order to move toward completion in the most cost-effective manner.

Testing.—The Committee recommends $623,400,000 for testing activities which is $56,435,000 over the current funding level and $119,400,000 below the budget request.

For operating expenses, the recommendation includes $541,400,000, a reduction of $92,400,000 below the budget request.

The Committee recommendation for research and development includes the budget request of $4,100,000 for the Marshall Island program. The Committee directs the Department of Energy to prepare a joint program with the Department of the Interior establishing the individual agency responsibilities as legislated by Public Law 99-239.

Project 85-D-105, combined device assembly facility, the recommendation includes $14,000,000, an increase of $4,000,000 over the House level and the same as the budget request.

Production and surveillance.—The Committee recommendation provides for $1,289,204,000 for production, surveillance, and maintenance

of nuclear weapons, an increase of $3,251,000 over the fiscal year 1986 level of funding.

For operating expenses, the Committee includes $1,832,504,000 which is $92,715,000 above the current year level. Since the Department's testimony indicates that overall workload has not increased, the Committee concluded that the total increase requested was larger than necessary.

The Committee believes that with prudent management and through the full utilization of previously funded improvements in manufacturing technologies and equipment, the recommendation is adequate to maintain production schedules for all high priority systems including the cruise missile warheads, the Trident warhead, the modern strategic bomb, and the MX missile warhead. Full funding is included for preproduction activities for the Trident II warhead. The proposed reduction in operating funds also reflects and is consistent with the Committee action to cancel funding for the SM–2 warhead and the advanced ASW warhead and to end production of the W79 and W85 warheads.

For construction, the recommendation provides $330,700,000, which is $90,164,000 under the current funding level, and $5,500,000 over the House allowance. The Committee recommends no funding for facilities to begin production of the SM–2 missile warhead and the antisubmarine warhead. The Committee also recommends that funds for facilities to support the SCRAM II warhead be deferred. This action is consistent with the Senate Armed Services Committee recomendation to slow the pace of SCRAM II missile development.

Project 87–D–121, general plant projects, the Committee recommends $30,000,000, the same as the House, in lieu of the requested amount of $32,000,000.

Project 86–D–130, tritium loading facility replacement, the recommendation includes $30,000,000 for construction of this project, the same as the House allowance and $25,300,000 over the current year.

Project 84–D–112, Trident II warhead production facilities, the Committee provides $14,500,000, the same as the budget request and $4,500,000 over the House allowance.

Project 85–D–125, tactical bomb production facilities, the recommendation provides $14,800,000, the same as the budget and $3,000,000 over the House level.

Project 84–D–113, antisubmarine warfare/standoff weapon warhead production facilities, the Committee includes no funding for this project in fiscal year 1987.

Project 82–D–107, utilities and equipment restoration, the Committee provides $101,900,000 for phase III of this multiyear effort which will defer some restoration activities for future years.

Project 82–D–109, 155 mm artillery fired atomic projectile, development of a new 155 mm nuclear projectile began in 1969 with the Army stating a need for a modernized artillery shell to replace the deployed W48. Development of the W74 warhead began that year and continued into 1973 when the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy terminated the

program due to excessive cost and the use of obsolete technology. Requests to reinitiate the 155 mm development were denied by Congress in 1975 and 1976, but, in 1977, a new analysis of modernization requirements led to congressional authorization and appropriation of funds to reinitiate a research program.

The research development of the new projectile continued until 1979 when the Secretary of Defense directed a deep cut in the fiscal year 1981 budget request and then eliminated development funds in fiscal year 1982. Pursuant to the revised budget request, Congress approved further research and development engineering funds for the new 155 mm nuclear warhead, the W82, in fiscal year 1982.

The fiscal year 1983 and 1984 budget request proposed funding for production facilities and equipment for the W82, 155 mm artillery warhead. Citing the high costs of the warhead and the uncertainty of deployment, Congress did not provide any production funds for the W82 in fiscal year 1983 and 1984. No funds were requested for this project by the administration in fiscal year 1985.

In response to section 1635 of Public Law 98–525, a plan has been submitted which limits the production of the W82 and halts production in fiscal year 1986 of the W79, the 8-inch artillery fired atomic projectile warhead. Using 1978 constant dollars and excluding all indirect research, development, testing, production, and surveillance costs, the plan limits the production of these battlefield nuclear warheads to a total of 925 units within the total cost of $1,100,000,000. The plan also prohibits any further production of enhanced radiation warheads or ER components for either the W79 or the W82 warhead.

Due to the elimination of the ER portion of the program and as a result of the other restrictions imposed by Public Law 98–525, the total estimated costs of the W82 program have been substantially reduced and there is a greater likelihood of eventual deployment of the projectile. Accordingly, the Committee includes $10,000,000 for production facilities for the nonenhanced radiation W82, the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

MATERIALS PRODUCTION

The Materials Production Program primarily provides the special nuclear materials used in the development, testing, and production of nuclear weapons. The Committee recommends increases to allow the Department to continue to operate necessary production reactors, processing facilities, and support facilities. These facilities include a reactor feed material production complex, production reactors at Savannah River and Richland, spent fuel chemical processing plants at Savannah River, Richland, and Idaho, and support facilities.

Because of the magnitude of the investment and lead times involved, the Department must give increased emphasis to long-term planning in the Materials Production Program. The availability of special nuclear materials is influenced as much by recovery of materials from weapons being retired as it is influenced by the new production of such mater-

63-659 O - 86 - 6

ials. Additional attention needs to be focused on the Retirement Program as well as all other alternatives for meeting special materials requirements.

The Committee recommendation for materials production totals $1,889,146,000 which is $120,997,000 above the current level and $23,600,000 below the House allowance.

Reactor operations.—The Committee provides $621,950,000 for operating expenses for reactor operations, an increase of $41,012,000 over the 1986 funding level which allows for inflation increases over the current year. The increase from current levels of funding provides for operation of reactor feed plants at Fernald and Astabula, OH, and Oak Ridge, TN, the N Reactor at Richland, WA, and four production reactors at Savannah River, SC.

N Reactor.—The accident at Chernobyl has generated additional concern over the safety of the N Reactor at Hanford which is similar in some respects to the Russian reactor. Recent safety reviews by outside experts have not recommended a halt in operation of the reactor. These reviews, however, have recommended changes in some aspects of the operation of the N Reactor. The Department's safety review team concluded "there are no indications that a serious accident is likely to occur at the N Reactor, nor are contractor employees or the public subjected to unacceptable risks. . . . Even though the facility is being operated in a generally safe and cautious manner by competent and experienced personnel, 51 recommendations are presented in this report. No recommendations are made to correct deficiencies that could compromise safe operation . . . ." Since these recommendations will improve operations and reduce risks to on-site personnel, the Committee directs the Department to begin implementation immediately. The Committee recommendation provides an additional $20,000,000 to begin implementation in fiscal year 1987. If further operating, capital, or construction funding is required for these or other recommendations which may arise from subsequent reviews, the Department should submit promptly a reprogramming request to move funding into this important area.

Studies by the Department indicate that the aging N Reactor can be operated safely and economically until about 1995. The continued operation through 1995, however, will require substantial capital investments in maintenance and replacement equipment in an amount of well over $100,000,000. In addition, conditions have now been identified in the graphite-moderated N Reactor which will limit its useful life. There is evidence of graphite growth and process tube degradation along with other conditions which clearly show that it is the most vulnerable reactor asset within the nuclear materials production system.

The budget request proposes $21,891,000 for the Production Assurance Program which is designed to extend the life of the N Reactor beyond 1995 to as far as 2025. This would extend operations of the N Reactor over 40 years beyond its design life. The total estimated cost of the production assurance effort would probably exceed $1,200,000,000.

Due to the extremely high cost and the many uncertainties surrounding the extension of plant life, the Committee provides no funding in this account for the Production Assurance Program or any other activities which are designed to extend the operation of the N Reactor beyond 1995. If activities dealing with the safe and efficient operation of the N Reactor through 1995 are improperly included in the Production Assurance Program, then the Committee urges the Department to outline those additional needs in future reprogramming or budget requests.

Based on the high costs of the N Reactor, the Department should carefully review plans to continue its operation. The Committee urges the Department to reexamine its long-term requirements for special nuclear materials in light of recent and anticipated changes in the stockpile memorandum. Moreover, the Department should continue to explore all cost-effective options for meeting future material requirements including modified warhead delivery schedules, increased retirements of old warheads, new separation technologies, increased use of existing materials inventories, modified use of existing facilities, and options for a new production reactor.

Processing of nuclear materials.—The Committee recommends $545,190,000 for processing of nuclear materials which is $47,364,000 over the 1986 level of funding. For operating expenses, the Committee provides $480,830,000 which is $19,000,000 below the budget request and a $15,998,000 increase over the current year level. This allowance will provide for major processing activities at Richland, Savannah River, and Idaho Falls.

The budget request for special isotope separation [SIS] is $75,900,000, all in operating funds pending the result of an SIS readiness review. The readiness review panel recently found that the SIS is ready to proceed with definitive production plant design. Therefore, the Committee directs that within the $75,900,000 provided for SIS, $25,000,000 be made available for construction project 86–D–148, SIS design, and such site preparatory work as is necessary to satisfy the environmental requirements that must be met before final site selection.

Supporting services.—The Committee recommendation for supporting services includes $413,516,000, an increase of $25,547,000 over the current year and $10,400,000 above the House allowance.

For operating expenses, the Committee recommends $232,500,000 for the highest priority activities.

For construction, the recommendation provides $181,016,000 which is $20,400,000 more than the House and $45,000,000 below the budget request. Due to budget restraints, the Committee defers $29,000,000 for project 86–D–149, productivity retention which provides $47,225,000, an increase of $27,625,000 over the fiscal year 1986 level.

Enriched material.—The Committee recommends $171,500,000 for enriched materials necessary for fuels for the production reactors and naval reactor cores which is $33,000,000 below the request and $1,900,000 above the current year level. In view of budgetary constraints, the Committee recommends a reduction in the requested amount. This

level would permit all naval reactor requirements to be satisfied, but would delay the achievement of the desired production rates at the facilities dedicated to this process.

Capital equipment.—The Committee recommends $114,090,000 for capital equipment, an increase of $4,550,000 over 1986 funding which provides for inflationary increases over fiscal year 1986. No funds are available for production assurance activities at Richland, WA.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Defense Waste and Byproducts Management Program includes near-term and longer term activities to assure that existing and future nuclear waste from Federal Government program activities can be isolated from the biosphere and pose no significant threat to public health and safety. For the near term, the wastes are managed through interim storage facilities. Simultaneous efforts are proceeding on development of technology and processes for long-term disposal.

The Committee recommendation provides a total of $714,400,000 for defense nuclear waste and byproducts activities, $10,000,000 over the budget request and $69,800,000 above the House allowance.

For operating expenses, $465,050,000 is provided, $10,000,000 over the budget request and $53,000,000 above the House allowance. In conformance with the budget request, no funding is available in fiscal year 1986 for byproducts and beneficial uses activities.

For construction, the Committee recommends $249,350,000, $16,800,000 above the House allowance and the same as the budget request.

Project 81-T-105, defense waste processing facility at Savannah River, the Committee agrees with the requested level in the budget and provides $135,000,000 for the project. This will provide for the continued construction of critical portions of the project.

The Committee is concerned with the continued disposal of contaminated liquids into soil at the Hanford site. The Department is directed to provide a plan within 120 days of enactment, which presents technically available options for ceasing this practice, including costs, and a proposed implementation schedule. The report should also provide a schedule for compliance with all applicable environmental laws and regulations.

The proposed Hanford waste vitrification plant [HWVP] will convert high-level waste to a glass form for permanent disposal. It serves the same function and is based on the same process technology as the defense waste processing facility [DWPF] at Savannah River. While some refinements and testing are needed, the basic technology for vitrification of Richland high-level waste is in hand and facility design and construction can be undertaken with confidence. The Committee recommendation includes $15,000,000 for design and related activities to expedite the schedule for development of the HWVP.

NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT

The Naval Reactors Development Program provides for the design, development, testing, and evaluation of improved naval nuclear propulsion plants and reactor cores. The nuclear propulsion plants and cores cover a wide range of configurations and power ratings suitable for installation in naval combatants varying in size from small submarines to large surface ships.

The Committee recommendation includes $573,600,000 for the Naval Reactor Development Program which reflects a reduction of $20,000,000 due to budgetary constraints. This may require the deferral of some activities to future years.

VERIFICATION AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY

This program provides for the research, development, testing, and support activities related to the detection of nuclear test activities in response to treaty verification and national security requirements; analysis and support for nuclear intelligence, export control and arms control issues; and the review of export licenses applications as required by the Atomic Energy Act as amended, the Nuclear Nonproliferation Act of 1978, and the Export Administration Act of 1979.

The Committee recommendation for verification and control technology provides $101,700,000, the same as the budget request and $11,000,000 over the House allowance. The total amount recommended represents an 8-percent increase from current year levels. The Committee believes this increase is justified based on the important contributions made by these programs in the area of verification and arms control technology.

NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommends $66,900,000 for nuclear materials security and safeguards development within this program, the same as the budget request and $7,000,000 over the House allowance.

SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS

The recommendation includes $33,300,000 for security investigations, the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Details of the Committee's recommendation, current year estimates, the budget request, and House allowance are shown in the following table:

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Operating expenses).....	(144,367,000)	(174,900,000)	(174,900,000)	(154,900,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(20,105,000)	(49,300,000)	(41,300,000)	(41,300,000)
III. General Science program direction - OE.....	2,092,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
SUBTOTAL, GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH.....	661,422,000	773,400,000	738,400,000	710,400,000
(Operating expenses).....	(516,284,000)	(604,900,000)	(577,900,000)	(549,900,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(145,138,000)	(168,500,000)	(160,500,000)	(160,500,000)
Adjustments:				
Transfer of appropriation.....	-6,000,000	---	---	---
Addback of Proposed Transfer ES&H - (ESH)ESRD.....	300,000	---	---	---
Addback of proposed FTE reduction - (ER) GS.....	206,000	---	---	---
Savings from FY84 initiatives.....	---	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Undistributed reduction - OE	---	---	---	-33,000,000
Total, Adjustments	-5,494,000	---	---	-33,000,000
TOTAL, GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH	655,920,000	773,400,000	738,400,000	677,400,000
(Operating expenses)	(510,790,000)	(604,900,000)	(577,900,000)	(516,900,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(145,130,000)	(168,500,000)	(160,500,000)	(160,500,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Amounts in dollars]

Program line	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES				
1. Weapons activities				
A. Research and development				
Operations and maintenance	715,451,000	690,766,000	625,400,000	698,500,000
Capital equipment	82,422,000	104,215,000	104,215,000	93,015,000
Construction:				
07-D-123 General plant projects, various locations	24,850,000	21,350,000	21,350,000	21,350,000
Total				

[illegible]

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
89-D-122 Safeguards and security uninstalled Project 1> LANL> WV	7,870,000	----	----	----
89-D-123 Security systems uninstalled SNLA> NM	1,750,000	----	----	----
87-D-127 Buffer land acquisitions LLNL & SNLL	5,750,000	----	----	----
87-D-144 Evaluation technology laboratories SNLA	13,250,000	9,000,000	5,000,000	9,000,000
87-D-150 Advanced materials research and development facilities LLNL	----	----	----	----
81-D-121 Particle beam fusion accelerator-II	----	----	----	----

Prior year projects	4,500,000	—	—	—
Subtotal, Construction	135,660,000	140,820,000	124,230,000	127,830,000
Subtotal, Research and Development	1,035,436,000	1,239,900,000	1,125,400,000	1,219,400,000
B. Facilities				
Operations expenses	561,338,000	605,800,000	513,400,000	541,400,000
Capital equipment	66,207,000	73,000,000	41,000,000	55,000,000
Construction:				
07-0-100, General plant projects, MTS	—	5,700,000	700,000	5,700,000
94-0-101, General plant projects, various locations	5,700,000	—	—	—
05-0-104, Test devices assembly building, LAB	400,000	—	—	—
05-0-105, Combined device assembly facility, AZ	5,000,000	14,000,000	1,000,000	14,000,000
revitalization, various locations	12,900,000	15,300,000	14,300,000	14,300,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
84-T-108 Safeguards and site security upgrades, Y-12 NSC, OR	-5,400,000	----	----	----
Subtotal, Construction	21,400,000	37,000,000	33,000,000	27,000,000
Subtotal, Technical	566,765,000	740,800,000	607,400,000	623,400,000
Subtotal, Research, development and technical	1,582,299,000	1,982,700,000	1,824,800,000	1,842,800,000
C. Production and surveillance				
Operating expenses	1,139,789,000	1,468,594,000	1,477,594,000	1,422,594,000
87-D-121 General plant projects, various				

87-D-122 SNSB II warhead production facility, various locations	---	5,000,000	2,000,000	---
87-D-123 Productive chrome decon facility, Rocky Flats, Golden, CO	---	500,000	500,000	500,000
87-D-127 ESSW Uranium Mound Facility, Miamisburg, OH	---	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
87-D-130 Renovation of storerooms facility, Pinellas Plant, St. Petersburg, FL	---	300,000	300,000	300,000
86-D-122 Structural upgrade of existing plutonium facilities, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, CO	2,825,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
86-D-123 Environmental hazards elimination, various locations	5,240,000	10,300,000	15,300,000	10,300,000
86-D-124 Safeguards and site security operations, Phase II, Mound Facility, Miamisburg, OH	1,800,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
89-D-130 Tritium loading facility replacement, Savannah River, Aiken, SC	4,[illegible]10,000	30,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
85-D-112 Enriched uranium recovery improvements, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	12,500,000	25,800,000	21,800,000	21,800,000
85-D-113 Plant power and steam distribution, Paducah Plant, Kentucky	15,000,000	7,400,000	5,400,000	5,400,000
85-D-114 Safeguards facility, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	----	----	----	----
85-D-115 Savannah River tritium facilities, Savannah River Plant, SC	10,600,000	14,300,000	14,300,000	14,300,000
85-D-123 Air and water pollution control, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	15,140,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000

85-D-124 Safeguards and site security upgrade, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, CO	2,260,000	---	---	---
85-D-125 Tactical bomb production facilities, various locations.....	9,000,000	14,800,000	11,800,000	14,800,000
84-D-112 TRIDENT II warhead production facilities, various locations	60,700,000	14,500,000	10,000,000	14,500,000
84-D-113 Antisubmarine warfare/standoff weapon warhead prod facs, var locations	5,000,000	47,000,000	---	---
84-D-114 Consolidated nonnuclear manufacturing facility, Rocky Flats, CO	-2,280,000	---	---	---
84-D-115 Electrical system expansion, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	5,920,000	---	---	---
84-D-117 Inert assembly & test facility Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	5,080,000	---	---	---
84-D-118 High explosive subassembly facility, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	31,020,000	---	---	---
84-D-119 Railroad track replacement and upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	---	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
84-D-120 Explosive component test facility, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, OH	7,710,000	---	---	---
84-D-121 Safeguards and site security upgrade, Rocky Flats, CO	---	---	---	---
84-D-124 Environmental improvements, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	11,280,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
84-D-211 Safeguards and site security upgrading, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	12,220,000	30,000,000	22,000,000	30,000,000
84-D-212 Safeguards and site security upgrade, Pinellas Plant, FL	4,370,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
82-D-106 Weapon assembly facilities, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	-3,800,000	---	---	---
82-D-107 Utilities & equip restoration, replace & upgrade, Phase III, var locations	152,250,000	116,900,000	116,900,000	101,900,000

82-D-108 Nuclear weapons stockpile improvement, various locations	-800,000	---	---	---
82-D-109 155mm artillery fired atomic projectile (AFAP) prod facs, var locations ..	15,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
82-D-111 Interactive graphics system, various locations	4,230,000	---	---	---
82-D-146 Weapons prod & prod support facs, various locations.....	-950,000	---	---	---
81-D-115 MX warhead prod facs, various locations.....	---	---	---	---
81-D-120 Control of effluents & pollutants, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN.....	---	---	---	---
80-AE-5 Ground launched cruise missile warhead prod. facs., various locations.....	-1,000	---	---	---
80-AE-13 Pershing II airburst warhead production facilities, various locations.....	-8,000	---	---	---
79-7-N Utilities system restoration; Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN.....	-279,000	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
79-7-0 Universal pilot plant, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	---	---	---	---
79-7-P Facilities for a new modern strategic bomb, various locations	-26,000	---	---	---
78-16-A Cruise missile production facilities various, locations	-1,570,000	---	---	---
Prior year projects	-22,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	420,864,000	401,700,000	325,200,000	330,700,000
Subtotal, Production and surveillance	2,285,953,000	2,502,204,000	2,330,704,000	2,289,204,000
D. Program direction				
Operating expenses				
1. Weapons program	46,255,000	52,450,000	50,450,000	52,450,000
3. Community assistance	48,845,000	8,100,000	8,100,000	8,100,000

Subtotal, Program direction.....	95,100,000	60,550,000	58,550,000	60,550,000
Total, Weapons activities.....	3,963,452,000	4,545,454,000	4,214,054,000	4,192,554,000
(Operating expenses).....	(3,133,198,000)	(3,643,554,000)	(3,427,854,000)	(3,432,954,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(830,254,000)	(901,900,000)	(786,200,000)	(759,600,000)
II. Inertial confinement fusion				
Operating expenses.....	137,868,000	109,000,000	145,000,000	---
Capital equipment.....	9,500,000	9,500,000	9,000,000	---
Subtotal, Inertial confinement fusion.....	147,368,000	118,500,000	154,000,000	---
III. Materials production				
A. Reactor operations				
Operating expenses.....	541,098,000	616,660,000	607,660,000	576,660,000
Construction:				
87-D-156 Reactor effluent cooling water thermal mitisation, Savannah River, SC.....	---	5,000,000	---	---
86-D-150 In-core neutron monitoring system N-Reactor, Richland, WA	5,130,000	2,090,000	2,090,000	2,090,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
86-D-152 Reactor electrical distribution system, Savannah River, SC	2,710,000	7,700,000	4,700,000	4,700,000
85-D-136 Components protection system, 100-N area, Richland, WA	---	---	---	---
85-D-145 Fuel production facility, Savannah River, SC	18,000,000	35,500,000	25,500,000	35,500,000
84-D-136 Enriched uranium conversion facility modifications, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	12,200,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
83-D-180 Facility storage modifications, various locations	---	---	---	---
83-D-146 Water pollution control, FMPC, Fernald, Ohio	---	---	---	---
82-D-126 Reactor safety and reliability, various locations	1,800,000	---	---	---

81-D-143 L-reactor upgrade, Savannah River, SC	---	---	---	---
Prior year projects	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	39,840,000	53,290,000	35,290,000	45,290,000
Subtotal, Reactor operations	580,938,000	669,950,000	642,950,000	621,950,000
B. Processing of nuclear materials				
Operating expenses	464,832,000	499,830,000	489,830,000	480,830,000
Construction:				
86-D-148 SIS plant (design only), Richland, WA	3,805,000	---	---	---
86-D-151 PUREX electrical system upgrade, Richland, WA	2,380,000	3,900,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
86-D-153 Additional line III tritium furnace, Savannah River, SC	1,805,000	7,300,000	5,300,000	7,300,000
86-D-154 Effluent treatment facility, Savannah River, SC	2,500,000	15,650,000	11,650,000	15,650,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
86-D-157 Hydrofluorination system, FB-Line, Savannah River, SC	2,000,000	2,510,000	2,510,000	2,510,000
85-D-137 Vault safety SNM inventory system, Richland, WA	1,900,000	---	---	---
84-D-130 Modification processing facility substations, Savannah River, SC	---	---	---	---
84-D-135 Process facility modifications, Richland, WA	14,475,000	35,000,000	30,000,000	35,000,000
82-D-201 Special plutonium recovery facs, JB Line, Savannah River, SC	4,400,000	---	---	---
81-D-126 Pollution abatement facilities-chemical processing plants, Richland, WA	-233,000	---	---	---
Prior year projects	-38,000	---	---	---

Subtotal, Construction.....	32,994,000	64,360,000	53,360,000	64,360,000
Subtotal, Processing of nuclear materials.....	497,826,000	564,190,000	543,190,000	545,190,000
C. Supporting services				
Operating expenses.....	249,946,000	252,500,000	242,500,000	232,500,000
Construction:				
87-D-146 General plant projects, various locations.....	31,945,000	35,980,000	33,980,000	31,980,000
87-D-149 Reduced chemical discharges to process sewers, Richland, WA.....	---	3,150,000	3,150,000	3,150,000
87-D-150 Radioactive liquid effluent treatment facility, partial design only, Richland, WA.....	---	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
87-D-152 Environmental protection plantwide, Savannah River, SC.....	---	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
87-D-159 FMPC Environmental upgrade, Oak Ridge, TN.....	---	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
86-D-149 Productivity retention program, Phase I, various locations	19,600,000	76,225,000	43,225,000	47,225,000
86-D-156 Plantwide safeguards systems, Savannah River, SC	2,710,000	13,900,000	6,000,000	11,900,000
85-D-132 Plant engineering and design	---	---	---	---
85-D-139 Fuel processing restoration, IFPF, INEL, ID	13,530,000	35,000,000	18,000,000	35,000,000
85-D-140 Productivity and radiological improvements, FMPC, Fernald, OH	15,000,000	23,500,000	21,000,000	21,311,000
84-D-134 Safeguards and security improvements Plant-wide, Savannah River, SC	6,315,000	14,650,000	11,650,000	14,650,000
84-D-137 Facility security systems upgrade, IFPF, INEL, ID	4,700,000	300,000	300,000	300,000

83-D-138 Purex canyon & dissolver filter systems improvements, Richland, WA.....	-767,000	---	---	---
83-D-147 Pollution discharge elimination, Savannah River, SC.....	---	---	---	---
83-D-148 Non-radioactive hazardous waste management, Savannah River, SC.....	7,760,000	---	---	---
82-D-124 Restoration of production capabilities, Phase II, III, IV, & V, var locs..	39,600,000	7,811,000	7,811,000	---
82-D-127 Safeguards improvements, Savannah River Plant, SC.....	---	---	---	---
82-D-128 Plant perimeter security systems upgrade, IFPF, INEL, IDAHO.....	---	---	---	---
82-D-136 Fuel processing facilities upgrade, IFPF, INEL, Idaho.....	---	---	---	---
Prior year projects.....	-2,370,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction.....	138,023,000	226,016,000	160,616,000	181,016,000
Subtotal, Supporting services.....	387,969,000	478,516,000	403,116,000	413,516,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Enriched material	169,600,000	204,500,000	187,500,000	171,500,000
E. Capital equipment	109,540,000	126,090,000	114,090,000	114,090,000
F. Program direction	22,276,000	22,900,000	21,900,000	22,900,000
Subtotal, Materials production	1,768,149,000	2,066,146,000	1,912,746,000	1,889,146,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,447,752,000)	(1,596,390,000)	(1,549,390,000)	(1,484,390,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(320,397,000)	(469,756,000)	(363,356,000)	(404,756,000)
IV. Defense waste and byproducts management				
A. Interim waste management				
Operating expenses	262,221,000	324,730,000	288,730,000	324,730,000
Construction:				
87-D-171 General plant projects, various locations	23,453,000	26,535,000	25,535,000	26,535,000

87-D-172 WESF K-3 Filter upgrade, Richland, WA.....	---	500,000	500,000	500,000
87-D-173 242-A Evaporator/crystallizer upgrade, Richland, WA.....	---	2,800,000	2,000,000	2,800,000
87-D-174 241-AQ Tank farm, Richland, WA.....	---	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
87-D-175 Steam Transfer Line, RL.....	---	900,000	900,000	900,000
87-D-177 TRA Liquid radioactive waste clean-up, phase III, INEL, Idaho.....	---	700,000	700,000	700,000
87-D-180 Burial ground expansion, Savannah River, SC.....	---	6,300,000	4,300,000	6,300,000
87-D-181 Tank farm containment buildings, Savannah River, SC.....	---	1,360,000	1,360,000	1,360,000
86-D-172 B-Plant F-Filter, Richland, WA	949,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
86-D-173 Central waste disposal facility, Oak Ridge, TN	949,000	---	---	---
86-D-174 Low-level waste processing and shipping system, FMPC, Fernald, OH	2,372,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
86-D-175 Security upgrade, ID	1,958,000	7,300,000	5,300,000	7,300,000
85-D-157 Seventh calcined solids storage facility, INEL, ID	13,319,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
85-D-158 Central warehouse upgrade, Richland, WA	4,744,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
85-D-159 New waste transfer facilities H-Area, Savannah River, SC	8,118,000	8,200,000	8,200,000	8,200,000
85-D-160 TRA security system upgrade, INEL, ID	2,203,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	2,750,000
83-D-157 Additional radioactive waste storage facilities, Richland, WA	---	---	---	---
82-N-103 Waste handling & isolation facs, Richland, WA	2,069,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000

82-N-107 Rail replacement/Hanford railroad, Richland, WA	-400,000	---	---	---
81-T-103 Sixth set of calcined solids storage bins, ICPP, INEL, ID	-225,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	59,509,000	76,545,000	70,745,000	76,545,000
Subtotal, Interim waste management	321,730,000	401,275,000	359,475,000	401,275,000
B. Long-term waste management technology				
Operating expenses	89,773,000	88,820,000	88,820,000	98,820,000
Construction:				
81-T-105 Defense waste processing facility, Savannah River, SC	155,400,000	135,000,000	125,000,000	135,000,000
Subtotal, Long-term waste management technology	245,173,000	223,820,000	213,820,000	233,820,000
C. Terminal storage				
Operating expenses	23,982,000	39,100,000	32,100,000	39,100,000
Construction:				
77-13-F Waste isolation pilot plant, Delaware				

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Basin, Southeast, NM	-8,600,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Terminal storage	15,382,000	39,100,000	32,100,000	39,100,000
D. Capital equipment	33,769,000	37,805,000	36,805,000	37,805,000
E. Program direction	2,370,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
Subtotal, Defense waste & by-products management	618,424,000	704,400,000	644,600,000	714,400,000
(Operating expenses)	(378,346,000)	(455,050,000)	(412,050,000)	(465,050,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(240,078,000)	(249,350,000)	(232,550,000)	(249,350,000)
V. All Other				
A. Verification and control technology				
Operating expenses	84,201,000	95,500,000	86,500,000	95,500,000
Capital equipment	5,600,000	4,200,000	2,200,000	4,200,000

Construction:				
85-D-171 Space science laboratory, LANL, NM	4,500,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Subtotal, Verification and control technology....	94,301,000	101,700,000	90,700,000	101,700,000
B. Nuclear safeguards and security				
Operating expenses.....	52,598,000	61,100,000	54,100,000	61,100,000
Capital equipment.....	4,455,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
Construction:				
86-D-186 Nuclear safeguards technology lab, LANL, NM	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Subtotal Nuclear safeguards and security	57,053,000	66,900,000	59,900,000	66,900,000
VI. Security investigations - OE.....	32,200,000	33,300,000	33,300,000	33,300,000
Subtotal, All Other.....	183,554,000	201,900,000	183,900,000	201,900,000
(Operating expenses)	(168,999,000)	(189,900,000)	(173,900,000)	(189,900,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(14,555,000)	(12,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(12,000,000)

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
VII. Naval reactors development				
A. Plant development				
Operating expenses	62,500,000	71,000,000	71,000,000	71,000,000
B. Reactor development				
Operating expenses	251,700,000	274,000,000	274,000,000	260,000,000
Construction:				
87-N-101 General plant projects, various locations	3,770,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
87-N-102 Kesselring site facilities upgrade, KAPL, Schnectady, NY	---	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
87-N-103 Computation laboratory addition, Bettis, Pittsburg, PA	---	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
86-N-104 Reactor modifications, ATR, INEL, ID	4,500,000	---	---	---

82-N-111 Materials facility, Savannah River, SC	11,000,000	---	---	---
81-T-112 Mods. and additions to prototype facs, various locations	27,000,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	46,270,000	12,100,000	12,100,000	12,100,000
Subtotal, Reactor development	297,970,000	286,100,000	286,100,000	272,100,000
C. Reactor operation and evaluation				
Operating expenses	139,000,000	173,000,000	169,000,000	167,000,000
E. Capital equipment	25,300,000	51,700,000	46,700,000	51,700,000
F. Program direction	10,923,000	11,800,000	11,800,000	11,800,000
Subtotal, Naval reactors development	535,693,000	593,600,000	584,600,000	573,600,000
(Operating expenses)	(464,123,000)	(529,800,000)	(525,800,000)	(509,800,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(71,570,000)	(63,800,000)	(58,800,000)	(63,800,000)

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Adjustaents:				
Addback of G-R-H reductions against balances.....	7,157,000	---	---	---
Unobligated balance brought forward-operating expenses	---	---	---	---
Addback of proposed transfer for ES&H - (ESH) ESRD....	5,617,000	---	---	---
Addback of proposed FTE reduction - (DP) AEDA.....	2,084,000	---	---	---
Addback of proposed FTE reduction - (NE) AEDA.....	166,000	---	---	---
Undistributed reduction - OE.....	---	---	---	-310,000,000
Total, Adjustaents.....	15,024,000	---	---	-310,000,000
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES.....	7,231,664,000	8,230,000,000	7,693,900,000	7,261,600,000
(Operating expenses).....	(5,738,153,000)	(6,523,694,000)	(6,233,994,000)	(5,772,094,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(1,493,511,000)	(1,706,306,000)	(1,459,906,000)	(1,489,506,000)

Departmental Administration

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1986	$384,606,000
Budget estimate, 1987	395,116,000
House allowance	389,697,000
Committee recommendation	388,645,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−6,471,000
House allowance	−1,052,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1986	$9,941,000
Budget estimate, 1987	7,913,000
House allowance	7,913,000
Committee recommendation	7,913,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends a net appropriation of $144,611,000 for departmental administration which is $6,471,000 below the budget request and $1,052,000 below the House allowance.

The appropriation recommended for departmental administration supports the Department's general management, administrative, and program support functions not directly associated with program execution. The account provides for: (1) development and analysis of alternative energy policy proposals, legislation, and evaluation of DOE programs; (2) the salaries, travel, and other costs associated with the management and support of DOE; (3) the Institutional Relations Program that provides information services and outreach activities focusing on the industrial, academic, and public communities, evaluation of energy-related inventions and support for energy training and education; (4) the performance of security investigations for persons with access to restricted atomic energy data; (5) development of international energy policy and international cooperation in energy matters; and (6) revenues from the sale of DOE products and services and their related direct costs.

The Committee recommendations include an increase of $1,581,000 for a total of $3,187,000 for the Office of Minority Economic Impact. The Committee is concerned that the budget reduction proposed by the administration would have a significant adverse impact on the Department's program to enhance minority participation in energy programs.

With the funding levels recommended in the bill for the Minority Honors Training Program, the Department of Energy should continue to support scholarships for financially needy minority honor students in 2-year vocational schools, and should avoid closing down programs at these 2-year institutions.

The following tables show the Committee recommendations by program for new (budget) obligational authority in comparison to the current year, the budget estimate, and the House allowance.

63-659 O - 86 - 7

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

Section 302(a) of Public Law 95–91 transferred to the Department of Energy the power marketing functions under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 and all other functions of the Department of the Interior with respect to the Alaska Power Administration, Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the power marketing functions of the Bureau of Reclamation including the transmission and disposition of electric power and energy from Falcon and Amistad Dams, now included in the Western Area Power Administration.

Bonneville Power operations are self-financing under authority of the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974. The act authorizes Bonneville Power to use its revenues to finance operating costs, capital construction and to sell bonds to the Treasury if necessary to finance any remaining Capital Program requirements. All of the other power marketing administrations are funded annually with appropriations and related receipts are deposited in the Treasury.

PRIVATIZATION OF POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

The Urgent Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1986 contains a legislative prohibition that would reserve for Congress the decision on any sale of the power marketing agencies. The solicitation of proposals or the drafting of documents designed to transfer the assets of these agencies out of Federal ownership or control would be prohibited unless approved by Congress.

The provision also preserves for the power marketing administrations and the Tennessee Valley Authority their ability to routinely dispose of surplus property or transfer facilities or functions under existing statutes.

This action will preclude the damage to morale of the PMA and TVA employees because of uncertainty as to their future as Federal employees and will enable the power marketing administrations and TVA to make long-range plans without the uncertainty of their future.

The Committee reiterates its support of the provision contained in the Urgent Supplemental Appropriations Act.

RATE REFORM

The administration has proposed changes in fiscal year 1987 that would provide for a significant increase in the rates charged by the power marketing administrations. The Committee has historically been a strong supporter of fiscal responsibility by the power marketing administrations. The Committee has supported and encouraged the significant progress of Bonneville in bringing costs under control and setting a foundation for rate stability.

The Committee is concerned, however, that proposed rate reform would have significant adverse impact on the economic health of the regions supported by the power marketing administrations and would result in less repayments to the Federal Government because of the loss

of significant energy-intensive industries in the regions. The Committee has included bill language in the past preventing a change from a cost base to market base for PMA rates. This language was intended to prevent a unilateral change in the terms of agreement that were made years ago between the Federal Government and the regions served by the PMA's.

The Committee has been assured that the administration will make no changes in the rate development process administratively. The Committee therefore directs that the rate structure not be modified without the enactment of appropriate legislation.

The following table summarizes the appropriations recommended for the power marketing administrations.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION				
I. Office of the Secretary - Salaries and expenses				
A. Office of the Secretary	1,148,000	1,353,000	1,353,000	1,353,000
B. Other expenses	455,000	507,000	507,000	455,000
Subtotal, Office of the Secretary	1,603,000	1,860,000	1,860,000	1,808,000
II. General management - salaries				
A. Board of Contract Appeals	291,000	269,000	269,000	269,000
B. General Counsel	7,172,000	7,413,000	7,413,000	7,413,000
C. Inspector General	7,153,000	7,720,000	7,720,000	7,720,000
D. A/S Management & Administration	37,712,000	39,845,000	39,845,000	39,845,000
E. A/S Cong., Intergov. & Public Affairs	3,588,000	3,689,000	3,689,000	3,689,000
F. Operations Offices	54,395,000	57,323,000	57,323,000	57,323,000
G. Policy, Planning & Analysis	2,658,000	2,763,000	2,763,000	2,763,000
H. A/S International Affairs	2,479,000	2,832,000	2,832,000	2,832,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
I. Office of Minority Economic Impact.....	445,000	406,000	406,000	406,000
Subtotal, Salaries.....	115,893,000	122,260,000	122,260,000	122,260,000
III. General management - other expenses				
A. Other salary expenses.....	7,335,000	6,369,000	6,369,000	6,369,000
B. Benefits.....	12,967,000	18,842,000	18,842,000	18,842,000
C. Travel.....	3,776,000	5,775,000	5,775,000	5,775,000
D. Services.....	99,010,000	117,054,000	117,054,000	117,054,000
E. Workmens compensation.....	1,382,000	---	---	---
F. Capital equipment.....	9,941,000	7,913,000	7,913,000	7,913,000
Subtotal, Other expenses.....	134,411,000	155,953,000	155,953,000	155,953,000
IV. Program Support				
A. Policy analysis and system studies.....	4,243,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	2,500,000
B. Indian Affairs.....	289,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
C. Consumer Affairs.....	76,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
D. Public Affairs.....	415,000	206,000	206,000	206,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
E. Competition	96,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
F. International Policy Studies	963,000	1,700,000	700,000	700,000
G. Office of Minority Economic Impact	2,066,000	1,200,000	2,781,000	2,781,000
H. Cost of work for others	143,543,000	115,050,000	115,050,000	115,050,000
Subtotal, Program support	151,691,000	122,956,000	123,537,000	121,537,000
V. Miscellaneous revenues	-244,228,000	-251,947,000	-251,947,000	-251,947,000
Savings from FY84 initiatives	---	---	---	---
Use of prior year balances	---	---	---	---
Use of ESRD balances - (PPA) DA	-108,000	---	---	---
Use of ESRD balances - (IA) DA	-108,000	---	---	---
Use of ESRD balances - (MA) DA	-4,279,000	---	---	---
Use of ESRD balances - (GC) DA	-325,000	---	---	---
Use of ESRD balances - (BCA) DA	-27,000	---	---	---
Use of ESRD balances - (OSEC) DA	-54,000	---	---	---
Use of ESRD balances - (IG) DA	-325,000	---	---	---
Use of ESRD balances - (CP) DA	-162,000	---	---	---
Use of ESRD balances - (OMEI) DA	-27,000	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Addback of proposed FTE reduction - (MA).....	-3,636,000	---	---	---
Foreign travel reduction.....	---	---	-1,000,000	---
Public and Legislative Affairs.....	---	---	-5,000,000	---
General redustion (OE).....	---	---	---	-5,000,000
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION.....	150,319,000	151,082,000	145,663,000	144,611,000
(Operating expenses).....	(384,606,000)	(395,116,000)	(389,697,000)	(388,645,000)
(Plant and Capital).....	(9,941,000)	(7,913,000)	(7,913,000)	(7,913,000)
(Miscellaneous revenues).....	(-244,228,000)	(-251,947,000)	(-251,947,000)	(-251,947,000)

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
Power marketing - Alaska Power Administration				
Operating expenses	3,245,000	3,281,000	3,281,000	3,281,000
Use of prior year balances	---	-400,000	-400,000	-400,000
TOTAL ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION	3,245,000	2,881,000	2,881,000	2,881,000
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION				
(Limitation on direct loans)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)
TOTAL BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)

ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1986	$3,245,000
Budget estimate, 1987	2,881,000
House allowance	2,881,000
Committee recommendation	2,881,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

An appropriation of $2,881,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is the same as the budget request and House allowance.

The Alaska Power Administration is responsible for operation, maintenance, and power marketing of two Federal hydroelectric projects in Alaska. The operating projects are the 30,000 kW Eklutna project near Anchorage and the 47,160 kW Snettisham project near Juneau. Project facilities include dams reservoirs, powerplants, transmissions systems, and necessary maintenance facilities. Power is marketed at wholesale to five Alaskan utilities. The projects represent a current Federal investment of $131,000,000 and a replacement value in excess of $250,000,000.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

(LIMITATION ON DIRECT LOANS)

Appropriations, 1986	($20,000,000)
Budget estimate, 1987	(20,000,000)
House allowance	(10,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(10,000,000)
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	(−10,000,000)
House allowance	

Bonneville Power Administration [BPA] is the Federal electric power marketing agency for the Federal Columbia River Power System [FCRPS], which consists of the hydroelectric generating facilities in the Pacific Northwest of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior (30 projects at present), plus BPA's transmission system of more than 14,000 circuit-miles of high-voltage transmission lines and 381 substations. BPA markets about one-half of the electric power produced in the Northwest and provides about four-fifths of the region's bulk electric power transmission capacity. Also, BPA markets and exchanges electric power interregionally over the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie, and in Canada over interconnections with utilities in British Columbia.

BPA operates on a self-financing basis, thus requiring no appropriations. However, BPA's fiscal year 1987 budget reflects the need for additional borrowing authority of $276,100,000 to carry out the proposed program and new responsibilities pursuant to Public Law 96–501, the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act.

The recommended limitation on direct loans is the same as recommended by the House. BPA indicates that this level is adequate to carry out its responsibilities as required by law.

Borrowing authority.—A total of $3,750,000,000 has been made available to BPA as permanent borrowing authority. Each year the Committee reviews the budgeted amounts BPA plans to use of this total and reports an estimate of Bonneville's borrowing requirements.

In addition to the cumulative $2,304,000,000 available to BPA through fiscal year 1986, the Committee recommends an additional increment of $276,100,000 in borrowing authority in fiscal year 1987 for the construction, conservation, and fish and wildlife programs for a total of $2,580,000,000, including any unused portion from prior years.

In making available the additional borrowing authority of $276,100,000, the Committee recognizes the agency plans to use a lower funding level consistent with recent program reductions which were made to assist the region in its economic recovery and to hold down rate increases. The Committee supports these efforts and expects the BPA to submit promptly detailed program revisions.

Transmission system.—The Committee urges timely completion of the dc terminal expansion project. As indicated in last year's report, the Committee is highly supportive of this project and wishes it to proceed expeditiously.

Irrigation incentives.—The Committee is aware that the Bonneville Power Administration adopted an irrigation incentive rate effective during the July 1, 1985 through September 30, 1987, wholesale rate period. This action is consistent with the agency's overall mission and it encourages the use of electricity during off peak season when stream flows are high and demand for power is low.

The Committee understands the irrigation incentive rate will be reviewed in the upcoming rate proceeding scheduled to begin in December 1986. The Committee encourages BPA to retain the irrigation incentive rate and not to dilute its economic value. In making any adjustments on wholesale rates, BPA should seek to avoid disproportionate impacts on irrigation and keep wholesale rates for irrigation usage stable in relation to overall preference customer rates.

Repayment.—The Committee is pleased with the efforts of the BPA to control costs and overcome the difficult energy problems in the Pacific Northwest. In fiscal year 1985, BPA paid the U.S. Treasury $686,000,000, including $237,000,000 for amortization. At the end of fiscal year 1985, BPA was current in its payments of interest and amortization to the Treasury.

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1986	
Budget estimate, 1987	$19,647,000
House allowance	19,647,000
Committee recommendation	19,647,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommendation concurs with the budget request and House action which appropriates $19,647,000 for the Southeastern Power Administration.

The Southeastern Power Administration [SEPA] markets hydroelectric power produced at Federal projects located in 10 Southeastern States in accordance with policy directives contained in section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944. The States include Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, and Mississippi. There are 22 projects now in operation with an installed capacity of 3,092,375 kilowatts.

Southeastern does not own or operate any transmission facilities and carries out its marketing program by utilizing the existing transmission systems of the power utilities in the area. This is accomplished through wheeling arrangements between Southeastern and each of the area utilities with transmission lines connected to the projects. The utility agrees to deliver specified amounts of Federal power to customers of the Government, and Southeastern agrees to compensate the utility for the wheeling service performed.

The fiscal year 1986 budget request and appropriation was reduced to zero by applying unobligated balances from fiscal year 1984 and fiscal year 1985. The Committee recommends the fiscal year 1987 budget request of $19,647,000 which provides for the continuation of the basic power marketing program without new program initatives.

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1986	$29,191,000
Budget estimate, 1987	25,337,000
House allowance	25,337,000
Committee recommendation	25,337,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends concurrence with the House allowance of $25,337,000. This is the same as the budget request.

The Southwestern Power Administration [SWPA] is the marketing agent for the disposal of power and energy generated at U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' hydroelectric plants in the six-State area of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Missouri, Arkansas, and Louisiana. It is headquar-

tered in Tulsa, OK, with an operation control center located in Springfield, MO, and maintenance crews and support warehouses located in Muskogee and Ada, OK; Jonesboro, AR; and Springfield, MO.

The SWPA provides transmission lines, substations, switching stations, and communication facilities for integration and optimal distribution of electricity from hydroelectric projects for transmission and sale of power to geographically dispersed customers.

The SWPA schedules and controls the generation of power from 23 hydroelectric projects. In addition, the SWPA operates and maintains 1,390 miles of transmission lines consisting of 161kV, 138kV and 69kV wood pole and steel construction. It performs maintenance on 20 radio and microwave stations, 34 switching stations and substations, with a total installed capacity of 2,150,400 kilowatts.

As of the end of fiscal year 1985, the cumulative Federal investment in SWPA projects totals $839,100,000. Of this, $101,600,000 has been repaid to the Treasury plus interest totaling $375,600,000, leaving an unpaid investment of $737,500,000.

The decrease in appropriations for fiscal year 1987 compared to fiscal year 1986 is primarily the result of the availability of unobligated appropriation from fiscal year 1986.

Western Area Power Administration

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1986	$195,020,000
Budget estimate, 1987	236,846,000
House allowance	236,846,000
Committee recommendation	236,846,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $236,846,000, the same as the House allowance and budget request.

The Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance Program of the Western Area Power Administration [WAPA], excluding the Colorado River storage project and Fort Peck project, involves marketing federally generated hydroelectric power within a 15-State area in the West.

Western is responsible for the operation and maintenance of about 16,000 miles of transmission lines and over 242 substations. Electric power marketed by Western is generated by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the International Boundary and Water Commission in Texas, all of which operate some 52 hydropower generating plants in Western's service area with a current installed generating capacity of 8,865,000 kilowatts.

As of the end of fiscal year 1984, the cumulative Federal investment in WAPA projects totals $4,148,000,000. Of this, $1,760,000,000 has been repaid to the Treasury plus interest totaling $1,250,000,000, leaving an unpaid investment of $2,388,000,000.

WAPA funding requirements are based on an increase in purchase power and wheeling offset by an estimated $43,538,000 in unobligated balances from fiscal year 1986. These unobligated balances result from unusually high water levels in the region during fiscal year 1986.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1986	$91,459,000
Budget estimate, 1987	99,079,000
House allowance	99,079,000
Committee recommendation	99,079,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

REVENUES APPLIED

Revenues applied, 1986	−$49,470,000
Budget estimate, 1987	−78,754,000
House allowance	−78,754,000
Committee recommendation	−78,754,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1986	$41,989,000
Budget estimate, 1987	20,325,000
House allowance	20,325,000
Committee recommendation	20,325,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $99,079,000, the same as the budget request.

Section 204 and title IV of Public Law 95–91, the Department of Energy Organization Act, established within the Department of Energy the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to carry out functions transferred from the Federal Power Commission for hydroelectric, electric utility, and natural gas regulation and from the Interstate Commerce Commission for oil pipeline regulation.

The act sets out the clear intent of Congress that the Commission be independent from supervision or direction from any other officer of the Department, but provides that the Secretary shall provide to the Commission such support and facilities as the Commission determines it needs to carry out its functions. This support includes services for personnel, accounting, facilities support, computer operations, procurement, and other similar services funded elsewhere in the Departmental request.

FERC User Fees.—The administration's budget request estimated that FERC revenues from fees imposed on regulated industries will total

$78,754,000 in fiscal year 1987 and proposed that these revenues be retained to offset the Commission's operating expenses. While the intention of this proposal is consistent with other revenue-generating activities of the Federal Government, the manner in which this would be applied to FERC would have unanticipated and undesirable impacts on FERC's responsibilities. Because of this, the Committee recommendation revises the appropriation language passed by the House to provide that estimated revenues could be retained and used to offset FERC expenses, but the full recommended total budget authority is available to the Commission at the beginning of the fiscal year and would be reduced only as revenues become available during the fiscal year. The revised language, furthermore, provides only for estimated revenues so that if FERC is unable to actually collect the $78,754,000 in fees, then their programs and activities will not be reduced as a result of this. Conversely, if more than $78,754,000 is collected, this will further reduce the amount of appropriated funds needed.

Geothermal Resources Development Fund

GEOTHERMAL LOAN GUARANTEE AND INTEREST ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1986	$69,000
Budget estimate, 1987	72,000
House allowance	72,000
Committee recommendation	72,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $72,000. This is the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

The Geothermal Loan Guarantee and Interest Assistance Program is authorized under the Geothermal Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–410), as amended by the Department of Energy Act of 1978—Civilian Applications (Public Law 95–238).

The purpose of the program is to accelerate the commercial development and utilization of geothermal energy. Loan guarantees approved under this program are expected to achieve (1) development of normal borrower-lender relationships which, through experience, will encourage the flow of credit without further dependence on Federal financial assistance and (2) enhanced competition to encourage new contracts into the geothermal market.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 1986	$116,945,000
Budget estimate, 1987	
House allowance	105,000,000
Committee recommendation	105,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+105,000,000
House allowance	

The Committee recommends $105,000,000 for Appalachian regional development activities, including salaries and expenses.

The fiscal year 1987 recommendation of $105,000,000 is provided in a single appropriation account. The appropriation finances the full cost of the Office of the Federal Cochairperson and 50 percent of the administrative expenses of the Commission. The action recommended also anticipates the 13 Appalachian States will assume a greater portion of the Commission's administrative budget as the Federal role is reduced.

The Committee recommendation reflects the phasing down of the Appalachian development programs. The action recommended also reflects the constraints imposed by the congressional budget resolution and the concern with budget deficits. It should also be noted that the Appalachian Regional Development Act has not been extended by the authorization legislation since fiscal year 1982.

The Committee understands that the Commission has not acted to limit Federal participation in its activities to 30 percent as directed last year and has, therefore, included language in the act requiring such limitation on area development projects. The provision does not affect the Highway Development Program. In addition, in light of shrinking budget levels, the Appalachian States are cautioned to discontinue their practice of prefinancing the funding of construction of the Appalachian development highways.

The Committee understands that the Commission will continue to carry out programs for development highways and local access roads, stimulation of jobs and private investment, distressed counties, and the local development districts. The Committee urges the ARC to initiate and continue health and human services programs to address regional problems such as school dropouts, high rates of infant mortality, and the problems inhibiting medical services by small rural hospitals and clinics. The use and shipment of Appalachian coal is also encouraged.

The Committee feels that with limited dollars available, Federal programs that support State and local economic development efforts should permit the States to set their own development priorities, fulfill the commitment to developing human capital, encourage innovative strategies as well as a prudent level of support for cost-effective infrastructure projects, and to create an entrepreneurial environment favorable to growth and development.

Delaware River Basin Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1986	$161,000
Budget estimate, 1987	185,000
House allowance	185,000
Committee recommendation	185,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee concurs with the House allowance of $185,000, the same as the budget request.

This appropriation provides the full budget estimate for salaries and expenses of the U.S. Commissioner and his staff in representing interests of the Federal Government in the Delaware River Basin Commission.

CONTRIBUTION TO DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1986	$263,000
Budget estimate, 1987	200,000
House allowance	289,000
Committee recommendation	200,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	−89,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $200,000, which is the same as the budget request.

This appropriation provides the full amount requested for the Federal share of the annual expenses of the Commission.

Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin

CONTRIBUTION TO INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

Appropriations, 1986	$79,000
Budget estimate, 1987	
House allowance	79,000
Committee recommendation	79,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+79,000
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $79,000 for the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.

The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin was created in 1940 by compact among the four States in the basin, Maryland, Virginia, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, plus the District of Columbia and Federal Government. The Commission has the responsibility for basinwide water quality, planning, program coordination and assistance.

National Council on Public Works Improvements

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1986	.....
Budget estimate, 1987	[1] $2,500,000
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	2,500,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	.....
House allowance	+2,500,000

[1] Budget estimate contained in H. Doc. 99-239 not considered by House.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,500,000 for the National Council on Public Works Improvements.

This appropriation provides for the operation of the National Council on Public Works Improvement. This Council has been directed to report to the President on the state of the Nation's infrastructure.

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1986	$400,026,000
Budget estimate, 1987	405,000,000
House allowance	405,000,000
Committee recommendation	391,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−14,000,000
House allowance	−14,000,000

An appropriation of $391,000,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is $14,000,000 below both the House allowance and budget request.

The Committee recognizes the critical importance of the Nuclear Regulatory Program, including the need to assure the protection of the public health and safety. The Committee is deeply concerned about the safety research activities which have been responsible for providing a sound, technical basis for regulatory decisions. Within the funds included for safety research activities, $5,000,000 is provided for the continuing experiment capability project, an integral research facility to be built adjacent to the semiscale facility at the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory. This funding shall also provide for the continuation of technical integration centers research efforts.

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
Power marketing - Southeastern power administration				
A. Operating and maintenance	1,856,000	2,031,000	2,031,000	2,031,000
B. Purchase power and wheeling	12,879,000	19,705,000	19,705,000	19,705,000
Use of prior year balances	-14,735,000	-2,089,000	-2,089,000	-2,089,000
Addback of proposed rescission	---	---	---	---
TOTAL SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	---	19,647,000	19,647,000	19,647,000
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
Power marketing - Southwestern Power Administration				
A. Operation and maintenance	10,874,000	11,802,000	11,802,000	11,802,000
B. Purchase power and wheeling	21,624,000	20,959,000	20,959,000	20,959,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Construction	5,456,000	5,819,000	5,819,000	5,819,000
Use of prior year balances	-8,774,000	-13,243,000	-13,243,000	-13,243,000
Addback of proposed FTE reductions	11,000	---	---	---
TOTAL SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	29,191,000	25,337,000	25,337,000	25,337,000
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION - CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
Power marketing - Western Area Power Administration				
A. Construction and rehabilitation	79,165,000	83,275,000	83,275,000	83,275,000
B. System operation and maintenance	74,477,000	86,100,000	86,100,000	86,100,000
C. Purchase power and wheeling	72,500,000	114,400,000	114,400,000	114,400,000
Unobligated balances	-30,300,000	-43,466,000	-43,466,000	-43,466,000
Addback of proposed FTE reductions	68,000	---	---	---
Less amount by transfer, permanent authority	-890,000	-3,463,000	-3,463,000	-3,463,000
TOTAL WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	195,020,000	236,846,000	236,846,000	236,846,000

Susquehanna River Basin Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1986	$156,000
Budget estimate, 1987	179,000
House allowance	179,000
Committee recommendation	179,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends $179,000 for salaries and expenses of the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, which is the same as the House allowance.

The Susquehanna River Basin Commission was created by compact (Public Law 91–575) among the States of Maryland and New York, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the Federal Government to enable them to participate jointly in the development of water and related resources of the region drained by the Susquehanna River and its tributaries.

This appropriation provides for the expenses of the U.S. Commissioner and his staff.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1986	$220,000
Budget estimate, 1987	240,000
House allowance	240,000
Committee recommendation	240,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $240,000 which is the same as the House allowance and budget request.

This appropriation provides for the Federal share of the annual expenses of the Commission. The compact provides that the amount required to balance the Commission's current expenses budget shall be apportioned equitably among the signatory parties by unanimous vote of the Commission.

Tennessee Valley Authority

PAYMENT TO TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

Appropriations, 1986	$99,528,000
Budget estimate, 1987	58,038,000
House allowance	100,000,000
Committee recommendation	100,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+41,962,000
House allowance	

The Committee recommendation for the Tennessee Valley Authority totals $100,000,000.

The Committee has carefully reviewed the President's budget request for TVA's appropriated programs and believes the proposed reduction of $41,490,000 below the level for the current year is inconsistent with the benefits derived from these activities.

TVA activities have and continue to provide many benefits to the Nation and the world. In the area of fertilizer development, three-fourths of the fertilizers made today are made with the aid of technology developed by TVA. Fertilizers developed by TVA are being used around the world to grow crops which feed millions of people. TVA has also been a leader in the area of energy research demonstration as well as natural resource development.

Over the past several years, TVA has made concerted efforts to refocus and shift program priorities as resources have declined. But more can and should be done to be responsive to changing times and conditions. Greater effort must be placed on securing additional State, local, and private sector funding; and the Committee expects new and additional user fees to be instituted to recover more program costs.

The Committee is concerned over increased reports of damage to aquatic life in the Kentucky Lake region of the Tennessee River. The Committee is further concerned that harm to fish, mussels, and other aquatic life may not be confined to Kentucky Lake, but may exist throughout the Tennessee River system.

A portion of this damage may be attributable to the drought and excessive heat throughout the Southeast. Other factors may also be contributing to the decline in water quality in the Tennessee River. Corrective action requires a complete understanding of what role these various factors play in contributing to the damage present in the Tennessee River.

Therefore, the Committee directs the Tennessee Valley Authority to expeditiously conduct a thorough study on water quality problems contributing to the damage to aquatic life in Kentucky Lake and other regions of the Tennessee River system. The Committee further directs the Tennessee Valley Authority to expeditiously conduct a thorough study on water availability problems throughout the Tennessee Valley Authority region caused by the drought and excessive heat.

The Committee concurs with the House in including a legislative provision that authorizes the TVA Inspector General to subpoena documents. This power is an important investigative tool that could be used in connection with any audit, investigation, or inquiry that the TVA Inspector General might undertake in the performance of his duties and responsibilities. Under this provision, a subpoena could be signed by the Inspector General.

The following table shows the allocation of the funds recommended for activities under this heading:

RECOMMENDED APPROPRIATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1986 program	1987 Budget request	1987 recommendation
CAPITAL INVESTMENT			
New lock at Pickwick Landing Dam	709	.....	.....
Columbia Dam and Reservoir	863	.....	.....
Dam safety modifications	5,857	2,610	2,400
Additions and improvements	3,864	1,500	1,790
Land and forest resources	240	.....	200
Land Between the Lakes facilities	106	.....	90
Fertilizer test facilities	5,191	4,350	4,400
North Alabama coal-to-methanol project	1,935	.....	.....
General facilities	2,278	1,333	1,670
Total, capital investment	21,043	9,843	10,500
OPERATING EXPENSES			
Natural resources:			
Water resources	8,053	3,500	7,300
Reservoir system operations	22,771	20,593	21,800
Land and forest resources	4,130	550	3,700
Resource management and development support	4,970	2,250	4,400
Land Between the Lakes	6,712	.....	6,250
Total, natural resources	46,636	26,893	43,450
Economic resources	14,896	.....	11,700
Agricultural resources development	4,931	.....	4,000
National fertilizer development:			
Fertilizer research	16,275	10,430	16,355
Technology introduction	12,085	10,205	10,500
Ammonia from coal process	200	.....	.....
Hardwood fuels research	3,265	.....	2,880
Total, national fertilizer development	31,825	20,635	29,735
General services	1,516	667	615
Total, operating expenses	99,804	48,195	89,500
Jobs bill (Public Law 98–8)	81	.....	.....
Total, program	120,928	58,038	100,000

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 503. Application of General Reductions.—In passing the Energy and Water Appropriations Act, 1987, the House approved language in section 503 providing direction for the application of general reductions, savings, and slippage adjustments, undistributed reductions based on anticipated delays, and possible sequestrations required in 1987.

For the purpose of the Energy and Water Development appropriations, programs, projects, and activities are defined to include any and all individual items or line items listed, discussed, described, included in or in any way identified or referred to in narrative or tabular documentation or references, including but not limited to the fiscal year 1987 budget submission of the President and supporting justification material as subsequently altered, modified or changed by congressional action identified in House and Senate committee reports.

The Committee is concerned, however, that the House language may remove the flexibility needed in applying undistributed reductions, and savings and slippage which are included in the budget submission to accommodate delays due to unexpected or unforeseen events such as weather, labor problems, changed site conditions, litigation, and other normal program adjustments.

Therefore, the Committee has included additional language to clarify its intention that for purposes of applying any possible sequestrations required in fiscal year 1987 by Public Law 99–177, each program, project, and activity as defined above shall be reduced proportionately before the application of any other general reduction or savings and slippage. Thereafter, any general reduction, savings, and slippage, or undistributed reduction is to be applied based on the occurrance of events that cause slippages in a way to allow flexibility in managing a multiproject program. However, it is not intended that this be used: (1) to eliminate programs, projects or activities; (2) to disproportionately reduce personnel; (3) to otherwise reorder funds or priorities; or (4) to initiate unfunded new programs, projects or activities.

Sec. 507. Procurement Restriction.—In section 507, the House includes a provision which would restrict the purchase of extra high voltage [EHV] power equipment by the Power Marketing Administrations and the Tennessee Valley Authority from countries that impose unfair barriers and restrictions on U.S. manufacturers.

In light of the important national security and industrial mobilization interest in maintaining a domestic EHV manufacturing capability, the Committee believes that Federal agencies, to the extent practicable, should purchase such equipment from U.S. manufacturers. Accordingly, the Committee has retained language in the bill that would restrict pur-

chases of EHV electrical equipment by Federal power authorities. The Federal Power Marketing Administrations and the Tennessee Valley Authority would be required to purchase their EHV power equipment from domestic manufacturers if the domestic equipment meets the agency's technical requirements and if the price of such domestic equipment is not more than 30 percent greater than the price of the most competitive foreign bid.

Because the purpose of this provision is to help level the playing field and create an incentive for other countries to open their markets to U.S. manufacturers, the increased Buy American differential would apply only to purchases of EHV equipment manufactured in countries that do not offer fair competitive opportunities to U.S. manufacturers of such equipment. Although this provision is limited to fiscal year 1987, the Committee will be monitoring progress in negotiations to extend the GATT Government Procurement Code.

It is the intent of the Committee that in administering this provision, the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the U.S. Trade Representative, shall determine whether nondomestic end product EHV power equipment sought to be sold to an agency subject to this provision is manufacturer in a country that offers fair competitive opportunities to U.S. manufacturers of EHV power equipment. In essence, this involves determining whether or not the country in question imposes unfair trade barriers on U.S. manufacturers of EHV equipment that are more restrictive than those imposed by the United States on non-United States manufacturers of such equipment. Among the factors to be considered in making this determination, with no single factor being dispositive, are whether the utilities of the country in question are free to, or in fact do, make significant purchases of U.S.-manufactured EHV power equipment; whether procurement opportunities are publicly advertised or otherwise made available in a manner that enables U.S. manufacturers of EHV power equipment to meaningfully participate in such procurement competition; and whether procurement contracts for EHV power equipment are awarded on the basis of the most competitive bid.

For the purpose of this provision, "EHV power equipment" shall refer to power transformers, power circuit breakers, shunt reactors, or other alternating current [ac] and direct current [dc] electrical equipment designed to be operated on systems rated above 242 kilovolts.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7, RULE XVI, OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 7 of Rule XVI requires that Committee reports on general appropriations bills identify each Committee amendment to the House bill "which proposes an item of appropriation which is not made to carry out the provisions of an existing law, a treaty stipulation, or an act or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session."

The following items of appropriations recommended by the Committee, not made to carry out the provisions of existing law or an act passed by the Senate in this session, are brought to the attention of the Senate in accordance with rule XVI, paragraph 7.

On page 24, under Energy Supply, Research, and Development Activities, the following language is included:

> *$86,070,000 shall be available only for the Center for Advanced Materials; the Center for Science and Technology; the Chemical Research Center; the Advanced Science Center; the Supercomputer Research Institute; the Neutron Scattering Center; the Sychrotron Radiation Laboratory; the Center for Information Technology; the Center for Science and Engineering Technology; the Center for New Industrial Materials; the Center for Nuclear Imaging Research; the Energy Research Complex; the Institute of Nuclear Medicine as described in the report accompanying this Act.*

On page 27, under Atomic Energy Defense Activities, $7,261,600,000 is included for the research, development, testing, production, and stockpile maintenance for nuclear weapons work; and for verification and control, special materials production, defense waste management, and nuclear materials security and safeguard activities.

On page 34, under Appalachian Regional Commission, included are appropriations for regional development programs and the access highway system in the amount of $105,000,000 for which there is no authorization.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 12, RULE XXVI OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 12 of Rule XXVI requires that Committee reports on a bill or joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part of any statute include "(a) the text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and (b) a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices

the omissions and insertions which would be made by the bill or joint resolution if enacted in the form recommended by the committee."

The act would amend section 123 of Public Law 99–190, the resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1986, as follows:

> SEC. 123. Appropriations and funds available to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall be available for, and the Secretary of the Interior shall immediately resume preparation of, all environmental assessments and statements that are necessary prerequisites to the translocation of a portion of the existing population of Southern sea otters (Enhydra lutris nereis) to one or more locations within their historic range in accordance with the recovery plan for such species. In preparing such assessments and statements the Secretary shall consider section 10(j) of the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1539(j)) as well as pending legislation that would amend such Act: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army is directed to accomplish emergency bank stabilization, shore protection, and flood control work to protect public-owned property in the vicinity of Jarvis Avenue, Fargo Avenue, North Shore Avenue, Rosemont Avenue, Burger Park, North Sheridan Road, and Lake Michigan in Chicago, Illinois, at full Federal expense using funds heretofore and hereafter appropriated at an estimated cost of **[**$1,000,000**]** *$2,300,000*.

The accompanying act would amend section 507 of Public Law 92–514, as follows:

> SEC. 507. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the North Loup division as authorized in this Act the sum of **[**$79,500,000 (based upon January 1972 prices)**]** *$333,865,000 (based upon July 1984 prices)* plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering costs indexes applicable to the types of construction involved herein. There are also authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be required for operation and maintenance of the division.

The Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, is further amended as follows:

> *: Provided further, That the official of the Tennessee Valley Authority referred to as the "inspector general of the Tennessee Valley Authority" is authorized, during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, to require by subpoena the production of all information, documents, reports, answers, records, accounts, papers, and other data and other documentary evidence necessary in the performance of the audit and investigation functions of that official, which subpoena, in the case of contumacy or refusal to obey, shall be enforceable by order of any appropriate*

United States district court: Provided further, That procedures other than subpoenas shall be used by the inspector general to obtain documents and evidence from Federal agencies.

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

PREPARED BY THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PURSUANT TO SEC. 308(a), PUBLIC LAW 93-344, AS AMENDED

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation	Amount in bill	Committee allocation	Amount in bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with the Committee allocation to its subcommittees of amounts in the First Concurrent Resolution for 1987: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development	14.5	14,529	14.9	[1] 14,857
Projections of outlays associated with budget authority recommended in the bill:				
1987				[2] 8,811
1988				5,088
1989				561
1990				47
1991 and future year				23
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 1987 in the bill		101		7
	Direct loans		Loan guarantees	
Credit authority estimates, fiscal year 1987	0.1	54		

[1] Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.
[2] Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.
NA: Not applicable.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986 AND THE BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987

[Becomes available automatically under earlier, or "permanent" law without further, or annual, action by the Congress. Thus, these amounts are not included in the accompanying bill.]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, 1986	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1987	Increase or decrease
PERMANENT NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY			
FEDERAL FUNDS			
Corps of Engineers—Civil: Permanent appropriations	$9,000,000	$9,000,000	
Department of the Interior: Bureau of Reclamation: Miscellaneous appropriations	350,000	350,000	
Colorado River dam fund, Boulder Canyon project	21,740,000	56,376,000	+$34,636,000
Department of Energy: Payments to States under Federal Power Act	570,000	570,000	
Bonneville Power Administration Fund (authority to borrow)	330,000,000	276,100,000	-53,900,000
Tennessee Valley Authority Fund (authority to borrow)	517,876,000	549,180,000	+31,304,000
Total, permanent new budget (obligational) authority, Federal funds	879,536,000	891,576,000	+12,040,000
TRUST FUNDS			
Rivers and harbors contributed funds	96,000,000	227,000,000	+131,000,000
Department of the Interior: Reclamation trust funds	16,741,000	28,062,000	+11,321,000
Department of Energy: Advances for cooperative work	125,044,000	86,450,000	-38,594,000
Appalachian Regional Commission: Miscellaneous trust fund accounts	3,310,000	1,198,000	-2,112,000
Total, permanent new budget (obligational) authority, trust funds	241,095,000	342,710,000	+101,615,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1986 adjusted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					1986 adjusted	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL							
Department of the Army							
Corps of Engineers - Civil							
General investigations	123,478,000	127,000,000	149,411,000	124,240,000	+762,000	-2,760,000	-25,171,000
Construction, general	879,830,000	1,072,500,000	1,187,734,000	1,061,260,000	+181,430,000	-11,240,000	-126,474,000
Flood control and coastal emergencies	23,925,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	10,000,000	-13,925,000	-15,000,000	-15,000,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	301,225,000	298,000,000	319,460,000	300,369,000	-856,000	+2,369,000	-19,091,000
Operation and maintenance, general	1,263,248,000	1,420,000,000	1,417,447,000	1,369,418,000	+106,170,000	-50,582,000	-48,029,000
Revolving fund	8,699,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	+3,301,000	---	---
General expenses	102,399,000	115,000,000	115,000,000	115,000,000	+12,601,000	---	---
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil: New budget (obligational) authority	2,700,804,000	3,069,500,000	3,226,052,000	2,992,287,000	+291,483,000	-77,213,000	-233,765,000
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR							
Bureau of Reclamation							
General investigations	32,571,000	27,820,000	32,320,000	26,929,000	-5,642,000	-891,000	-5,391,000
Construction program	499,267,000	576,759,000	592,359,000	577,059,000	+77,792,000	+300,000	-15,300,000
Operation and maintenance	126,960,000	150,000,000	140,000,000	150,000,000	+23,040,000	---	+10,000,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1986 adjusted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					1986 adjusted	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Loan program	37,624,000	38,021,000	40,651,000	37,480,000	-144,000	-541,000	-3,171,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(46,237,000)	(43,806,000)	(42,000,000)	(43,806,000)	(-2,431,000)	---	(+1,806,000)
General administrative expenses	47,084,000	51,200,000	51,200,000	51,200,000	+4,116,000	---	---
Emergency fund	957,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	+43,000	---	---
Working Capital fund	---	6,400,000	6,400,000	6,400,000	+6,400,000	---	---
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	744,463,000	851,200,000	863,930,000	850,068,000	+105,605,000	-1,132,000	-13,862,000
Total, title II, Department of the Interior:							
New budget (obligational) authority	744,463,000	851,200,000	863,930,000	850,068,000	+105,605,000	-1,132,000	-13,862,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(46,237,000)	(43,806,000)	(42,000,000)	(43,806,000)	(-2,431,000)	---	(+1,806,000)
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY							
Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities:							
Operating Expenses	1,479,043,000	1,062,807,000	1,064,696,000	1,084,438,000	-394,605,000	+21,631,000	+19,742,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	217,255,000	191,355,000	251,630,000	234,360,000	+17,105,000	+43,005,000	-17,270,000
Subtotal	1,696,298,000	1,254,162,000	1,316,326,000	1,318,798,000	-377,500,000	+64,636,000	+2,472,000
Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities:							
Operating Expenses	1,208,500,000	1,271,100,000	1,233,600,000	1,257,600,000	+49,100,000	-13,500,000	+24,000,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	342,612,000	15,300,000	22,800,000	28,800,000	-313,812,000	+13,500,000	+6,000,000
Subtotal	1,551,112,000	1,286,400,000	1,256,400,000	1,286,400,000	-264,712,000	---	+30,000,000

Gross revenues	-1,360,600,000	-1,286,400,000	-1,286,400,000	-1,286,400,000	+74,200,000	---	---
Net appropriation	190,512,000	---	-30,000,000	---	-190,512,000	---	+30,000,000
General Science and Research Activities:							
Operating Expenses	510,790,000	604,900,000	577,900,000	516,900,000	+6,110,000	-88,000,000	-61,000,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	145,138,000	168,500,000	160,500,000	160,500,000	+15,362,000	-8,000,000	---
Subtotal	655,928,000	773,400,000	738,400,000	677,400,000	+21,472,000	-96,000,000	-61,000,000
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund	499,037,000	769,349,000	677,649,000	380,000,000	-119,037,000	-389,349,000	-297,649,000
Atomic Energy Defense Activites:							
Operating Expenses	5,738,153,000	6,523,694,000	6,233,994,000	5,772,094,000	+33,941,000	-751,600,000	-461,900,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	1,493,511,000	1,706,306,000	1,459,906,000	1,489,506,000	-4,005,000	-216,800,000	+29,600,000
Subtotal	7,231,664,000	8,230,000,000	7,693,900,000	7,261,600,000	+29,936,000	-968,400,000	-432,300,000
Departmental Administration:							
Operating Expenses	384,606,000	395,116,000	389,697,000	388,645,000	+4,039,000	-6,471,000	-1,052,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	9,941,000	7,913,000	7,913,000	7,913,000	-2,028,000	---	---
Subtotal	394,547,000	403,029,000	397,610,000	396,558,000	+2,011,000	-6,471,000	-1,052,000
Miscellaneous revenues	-244,228,000	-251,947,000	-251,947,000	-251,947,000	-7,719,000	---	---
Net appropriation	150,319,000	151,082,000	145,663,000	144,611,000	-5,708,000	-6,471,000	-1,052,000
Power Marketing Administrations							
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Power Administration	3,245,000	2,881,000	2,881,000	2,881,000	-364,000	---	---
Bonneville Power Administration Fund:							
(Limitation on direct loans)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(-10,000,000)	(-10,000,000)	---
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	---	19,647,000	19,647,000	19,647,000	+19,647,000	---	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1986 adjusted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					1986 adjusted	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	29,191,000	25,337,000	25,337,000	25,337,000	-3,854,000	---	---
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	195,020,000	236,846,000	236,846,000	236,846,000	+41,826,000	---	---
(By transfer, permanent authority)	(890,000)	(3,463,000)	(3,463,000)	(3,463,000)	(+2,573,000)	---	---
Subtotal	227,456,000	284,711,000	284,711,000	284,711,000	+57,255,000	---	---
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission							
Salaries and expenses	91,459,000	99,079,000	99,079,000	99,079,000	+7,620,000	---	---
Revenues Applied	-49,470,000	-78,754,000	-78,754,000	-78,754,000	-29,284,000	---	---
Subtotal	41,989,000	20,325,000	20,325,000	20,325,000	-21,664,000	---	---
Geothermal Resources Development Fund							
Geothermal loan guarantee and interest assistance program	69,000	72,000	72,000	72,000	+3,000	---	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(500,000,000)	---	---	---	(-500,000,000)	---	---
Total, title III, Department of Energy:							
New budget (obligational) authority	10,693,272,000	11,483,101,000	10,847,046,000	10,087,517,000	-605,755,000	-1,395,584,000	-759,529,000
Operating Expenses	(8,484,815,000)	(9,393,727,000)	(8,944,297,000)	(8,166,438,000)	(-318,377,000)	(-1,227,289,000)	(-777,859,000)
Plant and Capital Equipment	(2,208,457,000)	(2,089,374,000)	(1,902,749,000)	(1,921,079,000)	(-287,378,000)	(-168,295,000)	(+18,330,000)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(-10,000,000)	(-10,000,000)	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(500,000,000)	---	---	---	(-500,000,000)	---	---

TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Appalachian Regional Commission:							
Appalachian regional development programs	45,000,000	---	105,000,000	105,000,000	+60,000,000	+105,000,000	---
Prior year unobligated balance	-10,000,000	---	---	---	+10,000,000	---	---
Appalachian Development Highway System	79,745,000	---	---	---	-79,745,000	---	---
Subtotal	114,745,000	---	105,000,000	105,000,000	-9,745,000	+105,000,000	---
Salaries and Expenses	2,200,000	---	---	---	-2,200,000	---	---
Total, Appalachian Regional Commission	116,945,000	---	105,000,000	105,000,000	-11,945,000	+105,000,000	---
Delaware River Basin Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	161,000	185,000	185,000	185,000	+24,000	---	---
Contribution to Delaware River Basin Commission	263,000	200,000	289,000	200,000	-63,000	---	-89,000
Total, Delaware River Basin Commission	424,000	385,000	474,000	385,000	-39,000	---	-89,000
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin:							
Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	79,000	---	79,000	79,000	---	+79,000	---
National Council on Public Works Improvements:							
Salaries and expenses	---	2,500,000	---	2,500,000	+2,500,000	---	+2,500,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	400,026,000	405,000,000	405,000,000	391,000,000	-9,026,000	-14,000,000	-14,000,000
Susquehanna River Basin Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	156,000	179,000	179,000	179,000	+23,000	---	---
Contribution to Susquehanna River Basin Commission	220,000	240,000	240,000	240,000	+20,000	---	---
Total, Susquehanna River Basin Commission	376,000	419,000	419,000	419,000	+43,000	---	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1986 adjusted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					1986 adjusted	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Tennessee Valley Authority:							
Tennessee Valley Authority Fund	108,528,000	58,038,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	-8,528,000	+41,962,000	---
Prior year unobligated balance	-9,000,000	---	---	---	+9,000,000	---	---
Subtotal	99,528,000	58,038,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	+472,000	+41,962,000	---
Total, title IV, Independent agencies:							
New budget (obligational) authority	617,378,000	466,342,000	610,972,000	599,383,000	-17,995,000	+133,041,000	-11,589,000
Grand total, all titles:							
New budget (obligational) authority	14,755,917,000	15,870,143,000	15,548,000,000	14,529,255,000	-226,662,000	-1,340,888,000	-1,018,745,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(66,237,000)	(63,806,000)	(52,000,000)	(53,806,000)	(-12,431,000)	(-10,000,000)	(+1,806,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(500,000,000)	---	---	---	(-500,000,000)	---	---